Beginning of

Alexandrian influence on early Christianity

This title was preceded by

The problem of presenting the life of Jesus to the high school students of the Philippines

Labor and the teaching of Jesus : especially trade unionism and the relation of the Christian humanitarianism movement to the labor movement of Japan

Origin, development and significance of the tabernacle idea

The church and adult education

The Easter festival its historic background and customs associated with the past

Search by above titles on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1929 call number Thesis Cage 1929 v.2

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/b14106383

Alexandrian Influence on Early Christianity.

By

Robert Cecil McAdie B.A., B.D.

Thesis.

Submitted in the department of New Testament Literature and Interpretation, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of S.T.M. in The Pacific School of Theology.

A.D. 1929.

Alexandrian Influence on Early Christianity.

By

Robert Cecil Noble B.A., B.D.

Thesis.

Submitted in the department of New Testament Literature and Interpretation, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of S.T.M. in The Pacific School of Theology.

A.D. 1929.

The Alexandrian Influence on Early Christianity.

Table of Contents.

Part I.

Antecedents of The Christian School of Alexandria.

Chapter I.

From Septuagint To Sibyllines.

Chapter 2.

Philo-Philosopher and Mystic.

Part 2.

The Christian School of Alexandria.

Chapter 3.

Clement- Christian Gnostic.

Chapter 4.

Origen- Spiritual Non-Conformist.

Part 3.

Alexandria's Indirect Influence on Early Christianity.

Chapter 5.

The Isis-Serapis Mystery Cult.

Gnosticism.

Neo-Platonism.

The Arian Controversy.

Table of Contents.

Part I.

Antecedents of The Christian School of Alexandria.

Chapter 1.

From Septuagint To Philippines.

Chapter 2.

Philo-Philosopher and Mystic.

Part 2.

The Christian School of Alexandria.

Chapter 3.

Element- Christian Gnostic.

Chapter 4.

Origen- Spiritual Non-Conformist.

Part 3.

Alexandria's Indirect Influence on Early Christianity.

Chapter 5.

The Isis-Serapis Mystery Cult.

Gnosticism.

Neo-Platonism.

The Arian Controversy.

Antecedents of The Christian School of Alexandria.(Part I).

Chapter I.

From Septuagint To Sibyllines.

Antecedents of The Christian School of Alexandria. (Part I)

Chapter I.

From Baptism To Ethylinus.

Antecedents of The Christian School of Alexandria.(Part I).

Chapter I

From Septuagint to Sibyllines.

Whatever may have been Alexander's expectations regarding the future of that city,which he founded on the western edge of Egypt's Delta,it is almost a certainty that,as realized, Alexandria's historical development far surpassed his fondest dreams.

Undoubtedly the commercial possibilities of the location were vividly evident to the young conqueror,but of Alexandria's brilliant existence for many decades as the capital city of an independent Egypt he could have had no vision. Nor,under a different rule,could he have imagined it as a city of half a million inhabitants,second city of a vast empire,and the"first commercial city of the world"(a).

But while we may freely assign to Alexander and Deinocrates the unique honour of initiating this great foundation it is only a matter of historical justice to credit Alexandria's many-sided greatness to the enterprise and talent of the earlier members of the Lagid dynasty.Ptolemy evidently shared his leader's views in the possibilities of the new city, and in his twenty years rule,as Ptolemy I,he successfully applied that liberal policy which resulted in an Alexandria of which modern historians can write:"from the 3rd century,B.C. Alexandria became the centre of civilization",and "Alexandria was the centre of learning in the Roman Empire;---as a seat of research"(b). And it is this intellectual pre-eminence of Alexandria,developed through unsurpassed facilities

of material equipment and royal patronage,which furnishes a distinctive character to the type of Christianity taught by the Christian Fathers of the Alexandrian School.

That this should be so need cause no wonder to anyone who considers the persistent emphasis upon learning manifest during Alexandria's history from its foundation in the fourth century, B.C.until its final eclipse at the end of the fifth century,A.D. To the Alexandrians their university was as much a tradition and source of pride as was the temple of Diana to the Ephesians. Nor was the record of scientific achievments on the part of Alexandrian savants such as to disparage this local pride.While eclecticism and syncretism were largely in control where philosophy was concerned,in the realm of pure science Alexandria assumes an importance of the first rank.

In proof of this one needs only recall such names as those of Euclid,Conon,mathematician and astronomer,and his better known pupil,Archimedes;also,Eratosthenes,librarian and noted physicist, and Ptolemy,famous geographer of the second century A.D. Add to these the religious-philosophical contributions of Philo the Jew, of Ammonius Saccas and his famous pupil,Plotinus,founder of Neo-Platonism,as well as those of the Christian Fathers,Clement,Origen, and Athanasius,and the richness and value of Alexandria's scientific and religious intellectuality is at once obvious(a).

But this imposing list of literary gifts by Alexandria would surely be incomplete without mention of that work thus described by one of our modern writers:"The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament is,next to the New Testament,the most world-historic book"(b).While anonymous as to authorship this product of Jewish-Alexandrian Hellenism represents an epochal development

in Jewish-Gentile relations,and destined to play the leading part in Scriptural study by Christian teachers and writers during the first few centuries.

Before considering its special importance,however,it will be advisable to introduce such a study with a brief review of the Egyptian Diaspora and of those conditions,political,mental,and religious,which developed to its highest degree what is known as Jewish-Hellenism.In Egypt,and more especially in Alexandria,the "peculiar people",usually so prideful of its religious exclusiveness,more nearly attained the elimination of this national trait than anywhere else in the far-flung Dispersion.

The fact that "the Jews in Alexandria enjoyed a greater degree of political freedom there than anywhere else"(a) undoubtedly contributed largely to this unusual neighborliness. Alexander and the Lagids(with a few exceptions)strongly favoured Jewish colonization in Egypt.Of Alexandria this was so pronounced that the following statement by a leading writer is probably no exaggeration:"The most considerable of all the towns created by Alexander,Alexandria on the Nile,was,since the times of the first Ptolemy,who,after the occupation of Palestine,transferred thither a mass of its inhabitants,almost as much a city of the Jews as of the Greeks(b).

Of the city's five quarters the eastern two,or the Delta section of Alexandria,were exclusively Jewish,and here they enjoyed the benefits of practical home rule under their own ethnarch."That they had precisely the same rights(isopoliteia) as Macedonians and Greek settlers(Josephus,"Contra Apion",2.4) seems questionable in view of the more reliable testimony of Polybius"(c),yet theirs was not the status of the native Egyptian.

The road to the highest political preferment was theirs under the Ptolemies as is shown by the fact that Ptolemy Philometor entrusted the command of his army to the Jewish Dositheus and Onias,while his daughter,Cleopatra,conferred a similar honour upon Helkias and Ananias,sons of the high priest of the Jewish temple at Leontopolis (a). Nor was military service under the Ptolemies limited to Jews of high rank only;many thousands of of Jews were to be found enrolled in their armies during the whole period of the Ptolemaic rule.

This evidence of goodwill towards their Egyptian rulers is in strong contrast with the Jewish attitude towards Rome and the latter's policy in Jewish relations.The Ptolemies were looked upon as friends and benefactors and therefore worthy of loyal support and service;the Romans,despite the many imperial favors and concessions,were only considered first as conquerors and then as tyrants. So it is obvious that the unusual success of Hellenism among the Jews of Egypt was largely due to this sympathetic relationship between the rulers and the leaders among the Jews.

The Alexandrian type of Hellenism was peculiarly tolerant. As befitted the most cosmopolitan city of that age freedom of thought was the characteristic attitude towards all religions and philosophies. It was an age of transition;of unrest,mental and spiritual,and Greek philosophy itself,especially in its Platonic and Stoic aspects,was developing a tendency towards the satisfaction of widespread religious aspiration. And this religious hunger naturally led to a more sympathetic examination of all known religions,and this,again,as naturally,developed an eclectic or syncretistic attitude towards the whole subject.

The great Serapeum temple in Alexandria was an ever present

evidence of the popular trend. Isis-Serapis was an attempt to unite the mysticism of Egypt and the artistry of Greece, and while its influence among the Egyptians was insignificant its wide-spread adoption by hundreds of thousands over the Roman Empire evidenced its ability to meet some of the religious craving in those centuries. And Alexandria, with its unequalled intellectual equipment, was the logical "melting pot" for the varying types of religious and philosophical thought as represented by Greek, Egyptian, Oriental, and Jew.

Under the combined influences of a genial government, General religious tolerance, and unique intellectual freedom and ferment, the rigidity of Judaism in Egypt was considerably relaxed. "Hebrew religion, Greek speculation, and Oriental mysticism acted and re-acted upon each other, in warlike clash of opposition and the peaceful process of assimilation" (a). The result of this contact between Judaism and Alexandrine Hellenism fructified into one of the most surprising phenomena in the history of Jewish thought." There was formed a Neo-Judaism of Hellenic culture, which dealt with Jehovah not quite so badly, but yet not not much otherwise, than the cultivated Greeks and Romans with Zeus and Jupiter" (b). That later historic Judaism was but little influenced by this Jewish-Alexandrian movement is of less interest here than that this religious blend, neither Jewish nor Greek, did enter into and forms no unimportant part in early Christian thought; so much so that, in order to appreciate the influence of the Christian School of Alexandria, it is necessary, in all fairness, to recall its evident indebtedness to the methods, spirit, and studies of Philo and his predecessors in Jewish Hellenism.

In their commercial activities the Jews of Alexandria were

eminently successful. Their great Synagogue, with its seventy one golden seats, was a religious advertisement of their business ability. But if Alexandria "afforded ample scope for the trading propensities of the Jew" (a), in order to engage in cosmopolitan transactions a knowledge of the language of commerce was requisite. Thus for business reasons Alexandrian Greek took the place, as the spoken language of the Jews there, of the Palestinian Hebrew or Aramaic.

This change, however, meant more than mere commercial efficiency; it also revealed to enquiring Jewish minds all the varied fascinations of Greek learning." To Jews attracted by Greek thought Alexandria, in its Museum, Library, and lectures, offered abundant opportunity" (b). Amid the genial relations of Alexandria the Jerusalem exclusiveness largely evaporated, and Greek language, Greek names, Greek philosophy, and Greek wisdom, followed each other into the Jewish community. Stoicism, Peripateticism, but mostly Platonism, as more akin to the Old Testament, had numerous disciples; Judaism was transformed into a religious philosophy, and thus "it was in the mind of the Jew that Eastern and Western ideas were first blended in fruitful union" (c).

But to yield to the attractions of Greek ideals and at the same time remain faithful to the exalted claims of their own Scriptures was no easy task." Judaism was something different from the heathen religions. Its internal powers of resistance were incomparably greater than theirs" (d). Much time and ingenuity were required before Jewish-Alexandrian Hellenism could be presented as Philonism. It was not an event but a gradual growth, not a revolution of a day, but of nearly three centuries. There are certain definite milestones on this journey, and the first, and most

important of the Pre-Philonic, Jewish Hellenistic steps, by which we plan to exhibit the process of development, is the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, and commonly known as the Septuagint.

The other literary evidences of that growth will be (I) The Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas, (2) The writings of Aristobulus, (possibly "pseudo" Aristobulus?), (3) The Book of Wisdom or Odes of Soloman, and (4) The Sibylline Oracles. With so much dispute among learned authors as to the dates of these writings we do not venture to define this arrangement as chronological, although it could be defended as such, but rather as pertinent exhibits of a literary campaign by Alexandrian Jews having for its two main objectives a commendation of Jewish wisdom, as exhibited in this Greek translation, to their heathen neighbours, and a presentation of the reasons for their own increasing predilection for Greek philosophy. But their starting point is the Septuagint.

The Septuagint

"The chief seat of Hellenistic Judaism was Alexandria" and "the foundation of all Judaic Hellenistic culture is the ancient, annonymous, translation of the Scriptures known by the name of the Septuagint".(a). Thus Schuer evaluates the place and importance of the Septuagint in the development of Jewish Hellenism; it will be our task, in this brief sketch, to emphasise the unique influence of this Alexandrian product in the world's preparation for the Christian message as well as its immediate service during the formative period in the church's history.

Of its origin there is much less definite information than was, for centuries, popularly believed. Its very name is, as to authorship, a misnomer. The supernatural halo woven around it by Aristeas and elaborated by Philo, though still held by many

who prefer piously beautiful imagination to plain history,is no longer given any weight by scholars.

Modern research on this subject can be briefly summed up under three reasons for engaging in this great enterprise. (I) The royal command of Ptolemy Philadelphus.He was a book-lover and a friend of the Jews.(2) As an answer to the needs of the Egyptian Diaspora. To the Jew of Alexandria Hebrew was practically a dead language.(3) As an intelligible instrument for proselytising and theological discussion.(a).Doubtless all three reasons were present to the minds of those who carried it to completion.

As to the date of origin it may be said that the Septuagint is the work of different ages and many authors.The oldest part is the translation of the Pentateuch;it is of this that Aristeas furnishes his marvellous account(b)."The oldest Hellenists,Demetrius(222-205,B.C.) and Eupolemus(I60-I50,B.C),in their compilations of Scripture history,rely solely upon the Septuagint" (c),Aristeas,the historian,refers to it,and Philo describes an annual festival held at Pharos in honour of the origin of the Greek Bible(d). In accordance,then,with the general testimony we may accept the story of its initiation under Ptolemy Philadelphus; the practical completion of the whole Old Testament translation into Greek,by aid of the statement in the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus,may be dated as I32 B.C.(e).

That statement,however,only refers to the Hebrew Canon of that date;such books as Daniel and Ecclesiastes,which were canonized by the Jews at a much later date than that assigned to the statement by the son of Sirach,may not have been included. The growth of the S-ptuagint,like that of the Old Testament

was,in all likelihood,conditioned by the popular needs, and its evolution probably resembled that of the Aramaic Targums of Palestine(a). This would mean that most of it is the work of Alexandrian Jews,and the variety in literary qualities and occasional Hellenistic touches in the way of toning down crass anthropomorphisms, touches as frequent in the Pentateuch as elsewhere, might even suggest an entirely Alexandrian origin.

A few illustrations will help to prove the trend of an early tendency to substitute Hellenistic concepts of God for the Hebrew anthropomorphic descriptions. In Genesis 6-6,7,"God repented" is softened into "He took it to heart",in Exodus 24-9,10, "saw the God of Israel" becomes "they saw the place where the God of Israel stood",in Joshua 4-24,"power" is substituted for "the hand",and in Isaiah 6-1,"the train of his robe" is converted into "his glory"(b).However,these and kindred texts only suggest a germinal Hellenism;it was by the use of Allegorism and not through translation that the Bible came to be "largely a stalking horse for human speculation"(c).

Of the Septuagint Greek as a whole Schurer writes "Quite a new language,swarming with such strong Hebraisms that a Greek could not understand it,is here created"(d),and Fairweather remarks "the likelihood is that the Septuagint largely reflects the colloquial Greek of Alexandria as spoken in the 3rd century B.C."(e),while Kennedy adds the discriminating statement "On the one hand it has many elements in common with the writers of the "koine dialektos",on the other,it is often a transcript of the vernacular"(f). Also the writer in the Encyclopedia Brittannica directs attention to the violent contrasts in diction,not only between the different sections and books,but also within

individual books, and cites as an illustration the linguistic superiority of the first twenty eight chapters of Jeremiah over the diction of the remaining chapters(a). All of which goes to prove that in the Septuagint we have "treasure in earthern vessels", and not the uniformity of any one author or period.

Alexandrian independence may also be seen in the fact that in the Septuagint the order of books according to the Hebrew standard is not followed. For Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa, the Septuagint substitutes Law, History, Poetry, and Prophets, an arrangement still used in our English Bibles, and adding just another testimony to the fact that, both in conception and execution, the Septuagint, the religious masterpiece of ages, is the noblest contribution furnished by Jewish-Alexandrine Hellenism.

This greatness is evidenced by its vast influence in the propagation of Jewish ideals and Christian thought. The use of the Greek tongue in the synagogues developed a strong religious democracy(b), and as Greek was the spoken word of all the Diaspora, outside of Aramaic speaking Babylonia, the Septuagint became the voice of God to millions of Jewish exiles(c). We can safely endorse the statement by Hausrath on this point: "The Septuagint kept millions in the old faith, to win fresh millions, for whom the Hebrew text would have remained a buried treasure".

But in addition to this invaluable service for the Hellenistic Jews "the middle wall of partition that had hitherto divided the Jew from other nations was effectually broken down by this epoch-making work"(d). The Septuagint and its related literature revealed to Greek and Roman alike the sublime monotheism and religious hopes of the Jewish race, and "had doubtless accustomed the Greeks, and through them the Romans, to the

conception of God as a Saviour"(a). Virgil's prophetic outlook in Eclogue 4 seems an echo from Isaiah, and the knowledge of the Jewish Messianic hope and expectation of world dominion, as shown by Tacitus and Suetonius, may well be credited to the Septuagint, even if, as held by Schurer, their immediate source of information was Josephus(b). Thus "Greek Judaism with the Septuagint had ploughed the furrows for the Gospel seed in the Western World"(c).

But the Jewish hatred of Rome's domination and the wars which this developed practically destroyed all hope of success for Jewish religious propaganda, and the Septuagint became the Christian Old Testament. From its pages New Testament writers quoted almost exclusively, and its ancient, sacred, authority was now used to advance the claims of Christ against those of Homer, Pythagoras, Plato, and the Mystery Cults. And the success of the Christian faith, with its cosmopolitan outlook, its emphasis on the spiritual, and its use of scriptures in the popular language, vividly illustrates how greatly Judaism had failed through its insane insistence upon outward rites and nationalistic ideals.

Embittered by national reverses and angered by the Christian exegesis of the Septuagint, whereby they sought to prove the folly of Jews in rejecting Jesus as the promised Messiah, Judaism reacted violently against the use of their own greatest contribution to the world's religious literature. Instead of being looked on as a most worthy achievment the Septuagint translation came to be considered a crowning calamity, and this new sentiment was engrossed in the Rabbinic saying that "the day on which the Law was translated was as a "feast of darkness", a calamity "like the day on which the golden calf was made"(d). Unable, at that period,

to entirely ban its use by Hellenistic Jews,the new translations of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek by Aquila and Theodotion, translations which weremore in conformity with the authorized Hebrew,were produced in the second century A.D.as a useful weapon in exegetical conflict with Christians. Both versions were included by Origen in his Hexapla,and Theodotion's translation of Daniel was substituted for that in the older Septuagint.

Today the Septuagint is still with us,being practically complete in presentation by the three great codexes,Alexandrine, Vatican,and Sinaiticus,and must ever remind us of the debt we owe to the heroic broadmindedness of the Jewish Hellenists of Alexandria.As a closing word of tribute to this epochal work we shall now present a fitting statement by Fairweather: "Its antiquity,its exegetical value,its formative influence upon New Testament Greek,its independent witness to the text of the Old Testament-all combine to invest it with exceptional interest and value"(a).

The Epistle of (Pseudo) Aristeas.

Schurer,in the Table of Contents introducing vol.3,Div.2.of his great work "The Jewish People in The Time of Jesus Christ"places the above Epistle under thetitle of "Jewish Propaganda under a Heathen Mask", and it is only as an audacious piece of such propaganda,which,through later distinguished writers,received an unusually large amount of an utterly undeserved attention and respect,that we include it in this review of Alexandrian influence.

In historical values it is practically valueless,and its phlisophical-religious thought is merely commonplace. Under the search light of modern research both Aristeas and his story of

the Septuagint's marvellous origin have dissolved into myths. Aristeas was the name assumed by some clever fiction writer who saw in the Septuagint's history a first rate peg upon which to hang "a panegyric upon Jewish law, Jewish wisdom and the Jewish name in general from the mouth of a heathen" (a).

It was a story highly gratifying to Jewish vanity, and, later, to Christians also, whose reverence for the Septuagint version, as their Scriptures, was thus shown as all the more justifiable. The picture of the learned Greek, Demetrius Phalereus, as earnestly desirous to have the great library enriched with a copy of the Law, and the readiness of Ptolemy Philadelphus to grant that wish, is a fine representation of Greek learning and royalty paying tribute to the superior Jewish wisdom!

Ptolemy's despatch of an embassy to Jerusalem, of which embassy Aristeas himself is a member, laden with splendid presents to the priestly Eleazar, furnishes the writer with an excellent opportunity to write a glowing description of Palestine's Jewish institutions and prosperity. Emphasis is also laid upon the unusual honours granted the Jewish scholars on their arrival in Alexandria, while the conversations between Ptolemy and his guests are so arramged as to form "a resume of Jewish dogma, a catechism of the Law of Moses" (b). Finally, upon the conclusion of the work in seventy two days, the Alexandrian Jews are represented as the judges giving their votes in its favour, while the king "was much astonished at the wisdom of the lawgiver" (c).

The evident neglect of their nation and its literature which was apparent in Greek writers was a touchy matter with many Jewish admirers of Hellenic learning, and naturally a subject calling for some explanation by their apologists. It is therefore

of interest to note here how the writer of this Epistle solves the difficulty. He represents Ptolemy as enquiring why (Greek) historians and poets had failed to mention such great events, and Demetrius as replying that "the solemnity and divine origin of the Law" was such that "some who had wished to incorporate portions of it in their own works had been smitten of God and forced to desist"(a). That this solution was not general, or, at least, more than a passing phase, we shall note in discussing the views of Aristobulus, a later writer in this school.

But, as already stated, this epistle as history is merely interesting fiction. The key man of the whole story is Demetrius Phalereus, and modern research, beginning with Hody's Dissertation, first published in 1645, has shown conclusively how impossible it was for Phalereus to have played such a part, or, indeed, any part, under the second Ptolemy(b). And this, though the most important, is only one of numerous historical mistakes committed by the author(c). And as the supposedly historical character of the epistle was the real source of its long continued and widespread popularity, the discovery of its fictitious nature has naturally eliminated it from true church history, and it must now be properly classified as a rare and over-zealous bit of Jewish advertising, which the credulous, primitive Christians were only too ready to accept at its own high valuation.

As to the date of its composition there is a vast difference of opinion among students. More than two centuries separate Schurer's estimate of 200 B.C. and that of Gratz who places the date in the reign of Tiberius, while between these extremes are many intermediary dates, e.g. those of Drummond, Kautsch,

Wendland,and the Jewish Encyclopedia,vol.I. For the purposes of this study the matter is not of any particular importance,and so no definite decision is requisite.

Nor is the epistle's theological content deserving of more than passing notice. Deane,in his Article on "Alexandrian Theology",in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,vol.I., omits any discussion,and beyond suggestions of the identity of Jehovah with Zeus,of a world spirit,and a free use of allegory, there is nothing characteristically Alexandrian in the epistle. (a).A glimpse at its popularity is far more important here,and will furnish the reason for its inclusion in this discussion.

In an age when "signs and wonders"were matters of course in religious thought,and when little critical examination was given to authorities it was natural that this story,which placed a golden halo upon the origin of a book highly revered by both Jew and Christian alike,should receive ready acceptance. It helped to establish the Septuagint as a religious authority,and a religion of authority was the demand of age. The first reference to this epistle is found in Aristobulus,then in Philo,who adds to the honours of the translators by calling them "hierophants, prophets",while Josephus reproduces a great portion almost verbally.

The Christian Fathers are equally generous in treatment. Justin Martyr,Pseudo-Justin,Clement of Alexandria,Irenaeus,Anatolius in Eusebius and Eusebius himself,Epiphanius(with elaborations), Tertullian,Augustine,and Chrysostom,with others,all assisted to popularise the Aristean legend(b).In the list furnished by Schurer the name of Origen is wanting;one wonders if that master mind did not,through the exercise of his critical ability,"see through" the popular misconception? In any case,by means of its wide-spread dissemination through its many friends,the Aristean legend

developed into something resembling dogma,which helped,according to the writer in the Jewish Encyclopedia (vol.2,art.Aristeas), "to destroy the Bible criticism of Origen". The Aristean influence, then,must be reckoned as one of the factors in developing the pernicious theory of an exaggerated estimate of the letter at the expense of the spiritual.

Aristobulus.(Fragments).

Whether this writer was an Hellenistic philosopher or a brazen tongued imposter is an open question. Schurer holds the first estimate while Drummond emphasises the second (a),and there is such a commingling of philosophy and imposture in these Fragments as may well justify both opinions.

Addressing himself to Ptolemy Philometor,and through him to the heathen world at large,Aristobulus endeavours to prove the dependence of Greek philosophy upon Mosaic legislation.Naturally such an effort would require considerable Hellenizing of Moses,and so a free use of allegorism is indulged in.Thus the Bible mode of creation by the "word" is shown to be in harmony with experiences of Pythagoras,Socrates,and Plato,in "having heard the voice of God". He accepts the philosophic view of the eternity of matter and of God as beyond our knowledge;therefore the corollary also that a medistor between God and creation is needed.Such a Mediator is found in Wisdom.

In his explanation of the seventh day rest Aristobulus pays tribute to Pythagoras in emphasising the value of the number,seven being the symbol of reason,while his statement that piety,justice,and moderation,are required to meet the demands of the Law is similar to that of Philo (b).

We may then grant that there is enough of the

Alexandrian thought in these Fragments to align the writer with that school of philosophy,but we venture to believe that his philosophy alone would never have brought him a place in the writings of Clement,Origen,and Eusebius.His philosophic discussions are but the covers for the highly palatable but false statement that the wisdom of Pythagoras,as well as that of Plato,was drawn from the writings of Moses(a).

Thus Aristobulus differs from his predecessor,Aristeas,in explaining the painful neglect of Moses by the Greek writers.To Aristobulus it was evident that much excellent wisdom in Greek philosophy existed.But there was only one source of true wisdom-the Law,therefore Greek wisdom must have drawn from that source. But how could this be possible if there was no earlier Greek translation of the Hebrew scriptures than the Septuagint? There was only one way to answer that:there was an earlier translation!

We find the same thought in Philo but in a milder form;here it is an uncompromising assertion! May not this full-blooded development of this theory have some bearing on the date of these Fragments? Would Ptolemy,with all Alexandria's Greek culture at his command,be likely to accept such an audacious falsification of history? If the legend was so well grown in the middle of the second century B.C.why does Philo fail to rise to its level,and why do both Philo and Josephus entirely overlook this zealous exponent of an idea held by themselves in some degree? We are inclined to think with Drummond (b) that the reason is that this writer,parading under the name of Aristobulus,was not a pioneer in their field of thought,but a contemporary!

The writer's identification with the Aristobulus of 2nd. Maccabees cannot be justified if we accept the date of that letter

which indicates the reign of Physcon and not Philometor.But the latter was a friend to the Jews while Physcon was not,hence Philometor and Aristobulus,a royal friend and a distinguished member of the race,are chosen as fitting names through which to introduce this propaganda of the first century,A.D.(a). And here it is well to recall the fact that our estimate of this writer must almost entirely rest upon his own words seeing that the earliest reference to him is found in Clement of Alexandria,two or three centuries after the composition.And one who dares to falsify history so boldly,and to use for his arguments forged extracts from Greek writers,can hardly be considered a reliable authority.

Only a few of the early church Fathers refer to this writer.Clement of Alexandria,Origen,Eusebius,and Anatolius form the list(b),but what is of more importance here is the fact that so many of them adopted his theory of the Old Testament being the sole source of true knowledge. Clement accuses the Greeks of plagiarising from the more ancient wisdom of the Hebrews(c), Justin makes a similar claim(d),and Tertullian explained certain heathen rites by charging them and the wisdom of Greek sophists and poets to the credit of the Old Testament(e).

The modern rabid literalist or fundamentalist may be said to represent,in their antagonism to science,this old theory of Aristobulus except that they move in a narrower circle.The early proponents realised the difficulties,and so called in the aid of allegorism,while their modern brethren often take their stand on the surface meaning.In either case it is a tendency to deny progressive revelation and to worship the man made letter of the past than to seek the present guidance of the Spirit.

Book of Wisdom-or-Wisdom of Soloman

The high estimate of this work,as held by scholars both ancient and modern,may be illustrated by the following eulogy supplied by one of its modern critics:"It represents the high-water mark of Jewish religious thought in the period between the Old and New Testaments,and in some of its ideas has a remarkable affinity with the Johannine books and the Epistle to the Hebrews(a).

This affinity with New Testament thought or phraseology persuaded at least one writer that its author was a Jewish Christian and its date as after 70 A.D.(b),while another professes to believe that here we have a production by Apollos before his conversion!(c).On the other hand,Wisdom exhibits sufficient affinity with Philo to have led some in Jerome's day to attribute it to Philonian workmanship,a notion held much later by Luther also(d). These are interesting conjectures which rest on such inadequate grounds as must exclude them from serious consideration; the more thoroughly reasoned arguments of Schurer and Drummond(e) are more acceptable,and from these we may assume that Wisdom may be dated between Ecclesiasticus and Philo,probably in the time of the later Ptolemies.

"From the circumstance that Soloman is several times introduced as the speaker(e.g.9-7f) it has been called the Wisdom of Soloman.The book,however,is plainly the work of an (unknown) Alexandrian Jew,and its ascription to Soloman is quite in accordance with a well-known literary method of the time"(f). It is worthy of note,however,that this designation,Wisdom of Soloman,is that generally assigned to it by the Fathers,most of whom seem to have given it,possibly on account of its supposedly distinguished authorship,actual canonical value. The author of

the Muratorian Canon and Origen are exceptions in their doubts of this Solomonic origin,yet Origen's use of Wisdom 7.25,26,in conjunction with Col.I-15 and Heb.I-3,in developing his doctrine of Christ(De Principiis,Bk.I) proves that he,too,accepted this Alexandrian work as of canonical weight(a).

In the East and West alike Wisdom's popularity and authority were equally evident.Clement of Rome was evidently acquainted with it,Clement of Alexandria quotes it freely,Tertullian refers to it as "ipsa Sophia----Salomonis",Hippolytus considers Wisdom 2.12-20,as a "prophēteia peri Christou",Cyprian speaks of it as "scriptura divina",scriptura sancta",or,as "scriptum est",while Origen quotes it at least forty times(b).The incorporation of Wisdom in the Septuagint is an additional proof of its early acceptance as a work of the highest character.

Nevertheless,this universal honour and esteem must not hide from us the fact that after all the Book of Wisdom is only an unusually noble type of Jewish-Alexandrianism. The author's phrases and thought may suggest affinity with John and Hebrews but theirpivotal,personal,Messiah,Jesus,made perfect through suffering,is not in all his thoughts.Thus he is no more of a Christian than his great successor,Philo.Nor is his defence of Judaism such as would be expected of Soloman.Under the royal robes an Alexandrian Eclectic hides and speaks,advocating such doctrines of God and man as had probably never been dreamed of by the greatly over-rated son of David.

But the use of an outward Hebraic form closely related to the sententiousness of Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus,its strong denunciation of heathen idolatry,the glowing exposition and expansion of the excellencies of Wisdom,with Proverbs 8and 9 as

a scripture basis,and all presented in gem-like phrases of Greek rhetoric,may well have led those early Fathers to overlook those teachings in Wisdom which either contradict or widely deviate from those of the Old and New Testaments.

Our interest in this study,however,lies in observing the Alexandrian-Jewish content and its influence subsequently upon the Christian church.The latter we have already noted in the general use of the Book of Wisdom by leading Christian writers in Christianity's formative period;it remains for us to briefly point out the principal proofs of its advocacy of those ideas usually distinguished as Jewish-Alexandrian.

The writer approaches the later position of Philo on the impossibility of our knowing God(9-I6f),while his discussion of Wisdom is after the manner of a Greek philosopher discoursing of the Nous(a).And this description of Wisdom,as furnished in chapter 7,is such as almost suggests a distinct personality! What is said as to Wisdom's attributes is,however,also affirmed of God's "holy spirit"(9-I7) as well as of "the almighty word of God"(9-2,I8-I5,I6-2),so that we are compelled to assume that all three represent one and the same effluence or agency."Hence Wisdom is in a word the medium by which God works in this world" (b),and thus appears as an intermediary,more fully developed in Philo's Logos,between the supramundane nature of God and this sinful world.But neither Wisdom nor Philo's Logos are endowed with definite personality,so Drummond sums up this phase of Wisdom by saying "Wisdom is personal,but not a person"(c). From this Wisdom then it is only a step or two along the same philosophic line of thought to the better known Logos of Philo.

There is more than a hint of Stoicism in the author's description of Wisdom's rule(7.24 &8.I),a suggestion of the Stoic Wisdom of the world,immanent in and pervading it,also,in the enumeration of the four cardinal virtues(8-7).But the author's pschycology favours Platonic-dualism.The soul of man is pre-existent;the good soul receives an undefiled body(8-20),which suggests that the evil soul would be assigned to a diseased or evil body? Of this doctrine we shall learn more in our study of Origin.

The body is,therefore,only a temporary tabernacle for the soul(9-I5),after a time the soul leaves it and the body falls to dust(I5-8). "In this anthropology the territory of the Jewish view is entirely forsaken.Instead of a resurrection of the body, we have here the Greek view of the immortality of the soul"(a).

These are but a few of many evidences exhibiting this book's Alexandrian philosophy,a philosophy "so pronounced as to amount to an actual transformation of Judaism"(b). That this"transformed Judaism",however,had in it many gleams of Christian truth must be assumed from its general use by those early contenders for our faith;because,as beautifully phrased by Ewald,"In the nervous energy of his proverbial style,and in the depth of his representation,we have a premonition of John,and in the conception of heathenism a preparation for Paul,like a warm rustle of the spring ere its time is fully come"(c).

The Sibylline Oracles.

The only part of this "confused mass of miscellaneous material which is the despair of critics"(a),which is of interest in this study,is the older portion contained in the third book,and dating from about I40 B.C.,and generally conceded to be of Jewish-Alexandrian origin.The rest of this large collection,being much later in time and largely Christian in authorship(b),deserve no mention here,except that these Christian Sibyllines,being a continuation of the Jewish "pious fraud",may be accepted as some evidence of the influence of the earlier work.

That this third book is Alexandrian in origin is inferred from the language,"its pointed references to the ruling Ptolemy, and to that worship of animals which gave to Egypt an un-enviable pre-eminence in the shame of superstition"(c),but that it fairly represents Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy can hardly be asserted. "There are only the faintest indications of what is known as the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy. Its allegorical interpretation,its tendency to ascetic dualism,its incorporation of purely Greek conceptions,its doctrine of mediating powers are all absent"(d).

It has been already pointed out,in our studies of Aristeas and Aristobulus,that Jewish-Alexandrian apologists were quite willing to present fiction as history in their zeal for the glory of the Jew and Judaism.Along side of them we might place the equally reckless Artapanos,who commends Moses to Gentile consideration by identifying him with Musaeus and the Egyptian Hermes (e).To them,evidently,the end justified the means. And the period in the world's history during which they wrote was peculiarly adapted for such propaganda.The crash of falling nations as the Roman ploughshare passed through them,and the obvious futility of Greek philosophy to satisfy the human religious instinct,

had produced religious chaos in the West.In despair men were turning for consolation to the ancient and mysterius religions of the Orient,where age and imposing rituals gave added prestige. Thus the way was opened for Judaism,Mystery Cults,and,finally, for Christian conquest.With minds ready for portents and wonders it did not seem an incongruous thing to those hungry and uncritical souls that one of their venerated heathen Sibyls should raise her voice in behalf of monotheism,and the superior claims of Oriental Judaism.

Transformed into a Jewish prophetess she proclaimed in Greek hexameters the fatal folly of idolatry and promise of a golden age under the universal worship of the One God. "The adoption(by Jews) of such a vehicle for their communication is not without significance,the Israelite has consented to sing in a strange land one of the songs of Zion"(a),and that this initial effort was not without success is evident in its continuation by others,and its adoption by Christian writers as well.

Its influence also appears in numerous references to it by other writers. Polyhistor(80-40 B.C.)quotes Sib.3-97ff,and the same passage is found in Josephus(Ant.I,4).Clement of Alexandria is very free in its use,quotations from the 3rd,4th,and 5th books of the Sibyllines being found in the Stromateis,Protrepticus, and Paedagogus.Lactantius also draws freely from this source,fifty passages of this origin being found in his works.References are also found in Hippolytus,Justin,Tertullian,and indirect allusions in Origen and Augustine(b).

We see therefore that the Sibylline Oracles,as one phase of missionary Judaism,exerted no little influence on behalf of a monotheistic religious creed,and thus helps to prepare

the way for our study of that larger ,more philosophic,and more spiritual presentation of Jewish-Alexandrianism associated with the name of Philo Judaeus.

Notes on Chapter I. References.

Page I

(a) Mommsen, "Provinces of The Roman Empire", vol.2, p.285.
Fairweather, "Jesus and The Greeks", chap.6, p.57.
(b) Fairweather, "The Background of The Gospels", p.316.
Angus, "The Environment of Early Christianity", p.18.

Page 2.

(a) Fairweather, "Jesus and The Greeks", chap.6, pp60-61.
(b) Angus, "The Environment of Early Christianity", p.158.

Page 3.

(a) Jewish Encyclopedia, vol.I, p.362.
(b) Mommsen, "Provinces of The Roman Empire", vol.2, p.177.
(c) Fairweather, "Jesus and The Greeks", chap.6, p.58.
Mommsen, "Provinces of The Roman Empire", vol.2, p.179.

Page 4.

(a) Jewish Encyclopedia, vol.I, p.362.

Page 5.

(a) Fairweather, "The Background of The Gospels", p.316.
(b) Mommsen, "The Provinces of The Roman Empire", vol2, p.183.

Page 6.

(a) Fairweather, "The Background of The Gospels", p.316.
(b) Ibid. p.318.
(c) Bigg, "The Christian Platonists of Alexandria", p.2.
(d) Schurer, "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3, div.2, p.158.

Page 7.

(a) Schurer, "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3, Div.2, p.159.

Page 8.

(a) Angus, "The Environment of Early Christianity", p.158.
(b) Schurer, "The Jewish People in The Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3, Div.2, p160.
(c) Ibid. p.163.
(d) Encyclopedia Britt. Vol.24, Art. "Septuagint",
Philo, "Vita Mosis", 2.7.
(e) Fairweather, "Background of The Gospels", p.327.

Page 9.

(a) Fairweather, "Background of The Gospels", p.326.
(b) Drummond, "Philo Judaeus", vol.I, p.158.
(c) Fairweather, "Background of The Gospels", p.321.
(d) Schurer, "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3, Div.2, p163.
(e) Fairweather, "Background of The Gospels", p.328.
(f) Kennedy, "Com.on Deut". ;for details on language see his "Sources of New Testament Greek".

Notes on Chapter I, References, (Cont.).

Page 10.
(a) Encyclopedia Britt., vol.24, Art. "Septuagint".
(b) Justin Martyr, "Apologia", I.31.
Tertullian, "Apologia", 8.
(c) Fairweather, "Background of The Gospels", p.326.

Page 11.
(a) Angus, "The Environment of Early Christianity", p.135.
(b) Tacitus, "Hist.", 5.13. and Suetonius, "Vesp", 4.
(c) Deissman, "New Light on N.T.", p.95.
(d) Angus, "The Environment of Early Christianity", p.160.

Page 12.
(a) Fairweather, "The Background of The Gospels", p.326.

Page 13.
(a) Schurer, "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3, Div.2, p.306.
(b) Herriot, "Philon le Juif", p.65.
(c) Schurer, "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ vol.3, Div.2, p.308.

Page 14.
(a) Drummond, "Philo Judaeus", vol.I, p.231.
(b) Ibid. with footnote.
(c) Fairweather, "The Background of The Gospels", p.323, footnote.

Page 15.
(a) Fairweather, "Background of The Gospels", pp.324-325.
(b) Schurer, "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3, Div.2, pp.310-311.
Aristobulus in-Euseb. "Praep. evang". 13.12-2; Philo, "Vita Mosis", 2.5-7; Josephus, "Antt". 12.2; Justin, "Apol", I.31, & "Dial". c.71; Ps-Justin, "Cohor. ad Graece". c.13; Irenaeus, "Adv. Haer". 3.21.2; Clem. Alex. "Strom" I.22.148; Tertullian, "Apol". c.18; Eusebius, "Praep. evang". 8.2-5&9; Epiphanius, "Mensuris de Ponderibus". 3.6.9-11; Augustine, "De civitate Dei", 18.42-43; Chrysostom, "Orat. I, adversus Judaeos".

Page 16.
(a) Schurer, "The Jewish People in The Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3, Div.2, p.237.
Drummond, "Philo Judaeus", vol.I, p.243.
(b) Fairweather, "Background of The Gospels", pp.334-335.

Page 17.
(a) Clement of Alex., "Strom". I.22.
(b) Drummond, "Philo Judaeus", vol.I, p.247.

Notes on Chapter I. References (Cont.)

Page 18.

(a) Drummond,"Philo Judaeus",vol.I,p 250.
(b) Clem.Alex. "Stromateis"I,5,6.
Origen,"Contra Celsus", 4,51.
Eusebius,"Praep.evang".,7,8,13.
Anatolius(in Eusebius),7.
(c) Clem.Alex."Strom".I-21-29,& 5-14.
(d) Justin Apol.I-23,54 &Dial.78.
(e) Tertullian,De Corona,15;Ad.Haer.40;Apol.47.

Page 19.

(a) Fairweather,"Background of The Gospels",p.337.
(b) Shaw,"The History of Egypt",vol.2,p.141.
(c) Dean Plumptre in "Expositor",vol.I.
(d) Schurer,"The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3,Div.2,p.234.
(e) Ibid.p.234.
Drummond,"Philo Judaeus",vol.I,p.184.
(f) Fairweather,"Background of The Gospels",p.337.

Page 20.

(a) Schurer,"The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3,Div.2,p.235.
Ibid.pp.234-235.

Page 21.

(a) Fairweather,"The Background of The Gospels",p.342.
(b) Schurer, "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3,Div.2,p.233.
(c)Drummond,"Philo Judaeus",vol.I,p.226.

Page 22.

(a) Schurer,"The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3,Div.2,p.234.
(b) Fairweather,"The Background of The Gospels",p.345.
(c) Ewald,"Hist.of Israel",vol.5,p.434.

Page 23.

(a) Fairweather,"The Background of The Gospels",p.346.
(b) Schurer,"The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ vol.3,Div.2,pp.276-288.
(c) Drummond,"Philo Judaeus",vol.I,p.169.
(d) Ibid. p.175.
(e) Ibid.p.167.

Page 24.

(a) Drummond,"Philo Judaeus",vol.I,p.170.
(b)Schurer,"The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ vol.3,Div.2,pp.288ff.

Antecedents of The Christian School of Alexandria.(Part 2).

Chapter 2.

Philo- Philosopher and Mystic.

Chapter 2

Philo,-Philosopher and Mystic.

"Among Jewish Hellenists none other,besides Josephus,takes so eminent a place as Philo the Alexandrian"(a). That the historian has enjoyed a far greater popularity than the philosopher is not to be wondered at;the world has always shown a keener interest in narratives of supernatural events and bloody wars than in discussions of the spiritual possibilities in humanity. As the heir of two centuries of Jewish-Alexandrian thought Philo sought to be a creator of religious history rather than its recorder, and to him this seemed possible by providing a spiritual syncretism of Old Testament teachings and the noble concepts of Greek Philosophy.

We have already noted the phenomenal development of this religious trend in the writings of the earlier and less distinguished writers of the Jewish-Alexandrian school. To prove the dependence of Greek philosophy upon Mosaic legislation,and the consequent spiritual values of their teachings,had been the one great objective ,and where proof was lacking imagination,too frequently,was given the right of way.Thus the unity of the two systems of religious thought was demonstrated by declaring that "the pagan divinities were only Jewish patriarchs disguised under foreign names;the story of Hercules was identified with that of Abraham;Moses with Musaeus,the teacher of Orpheus,or with the Egyptian Thoth and the Greek Mercury"(b).

Such then being the prevailing policy and ambition of the Jewish-Alexandrian school it is evident that Philo was but one,although by far the greatest,of many who earnestly toiled

in this effort to Hellenise Judaism and Judaise Greek philosophy.

Philo's personal history is but slightly known. In his own numerous works he rarely mentions himself,and probably the retirement of a student offered but few salient points to attract the pen of a biographer."He was a resident,and probably a native of Alexandria,and belonged to one of the most distinguished families of that city.His brother Alexander was Alabarch,and not only by virtue of this office,but by his birth and property was the foremost man in the Jewish community"(a).The fact that he belonged to a rich family,however,hardly warrants Mommsen's description of him as "one of the richest Jews of the time of Tiberius"(b),especially in view of Philo's eulogy of those rich men who were willing to live "like the rest of us who are poor", (De spec.leg.2.5).

Jerome's assertion that Philo was of priestly origin (De viris illustribus,c.II) is without support in earlier writers, and is as mythical as the tradition of a meeting between Philo and the Apostle Peter,in Rome,during the reign of Claudius. Not even the dates of his birth and death are known;the only certain date in his life being that of his visit to Rome as head of the Jewish embassy to Caligula(De leg.ad Gaium).That this took place in the year 40 A.D.is well certified(c),and as he was a man of "age",a Jewish mode of stating that a man had reached the age of sixty,or thereabouts,it has been generally assumed that his birth occurred about 20 B.C.(d). As to his death it can only be conjectured that its occurrence fell between 50 and 60,A.D.

That Philo was possessed of unusually high qualifications for the task he had set himself is generally admitted.He "had some knowledge of Hebrew,and even of the Halacha or traditional law,while in the Haggadic interpretation of Scripture he excelled".

Thus Fairweather(a).Schurer,referring to Philo's classical qualifications,says "no other Jewish Hellenist was so fully saturated with the wisdom of the Greeks"(b),and H.A.A.Kennedy, in his book,"Philo's Contribution to Religion"(Introd.pp.I2-I4), supplies a discriminating synopsis of Philo's cultural broad-mindedness.

But Philo was no mere eclectic in religious philosophy. His personality is suffused with the glow of a vital religious experience(c)."His speculative effort to bring God into touch with the world of men through logos,dunameis,and angeloi,is no more successful than that of his revered master,Plato,to relate his Ideas to the realm of actual experience"(d),but the charm of religious enthusiasm,born of mystical vision,became a powerful recommendation of an effort to utilise Greek philosophy in the service of Jewish monotheism.

The blending of Judaism and Hellenism may have been, in any case,an impossible task;the developments in Jewish nationalism,even during Philo's own lifetime,rendered failure a certainty. The Maccabees had given the Jew a taste of national independence, and although this had been won largely through Syrian quarrels ,as it was afterwards thrown away to satisfy Jewish religious factionalism,the general effect was to inoculate Palestinian Judaism with an increasing expectation of a material,Messianic,kingdom, a deepening hatred of foreign rule,and a consequent loss of sympathy with the Jewish-Hellenism of the Diaspora,and therefore a practical renunciation of the prophetic,spiritual,world mission of Israel(Friedlander).

The Jewish Rabbis failed to see their opportunity in the changing Greek philosophic tendencies,"slowly feeling their way towards the monotheistic conclusions of the Jews"(e);their hate

of Roman domination, fed upon the fantastic and materialistic Messianism of various "Apocalypses" (e.g. Enoch, The Book of Jubilees, The Psalter of Soloman, and The Sibylline Oracles), obscured their vision to any spiritual values outside Judaism, and led to an increasing emphasis upon such external distinctions as set them apart from, and, in their own opinion, exhibited their superiority over, Romans and Greeks alike.

Such persistent advertising of their own superiority over and contempt for other nations naturally led to reprisals in kind. The Jew became an object of ridicule and contempt on the part of those so despised. To the Romans Jewish exclusiveness and lordly claims were both ridiculous and irritating. Cicero calls them "slaves--superstitious" (De prov". 5-10"; Pro Flacco", 28), Seneca designates them as "a wretched and criminal people" (Fragm. 42), Tacitus notes this Jewish dislike of foreigners, "Apud ipsos fides obstinata misericordia in promptu, sed adversus omnes alios hostile odium" (Hist. 5.5), which Juvenal also satirizes (Satires, I4.I03), and even the sage, Apollonius of Tyana, expresses his contempt for their unsocial attitude (Philostratus, "Vita Apoll". 5-33).

Nor was heathen contempt and dislike limited to literary attacks on the Jews; the public at large was not slow to note this Jewish attitude of assumed superior purity, and the bitter, violent reaction thereto was seen by Philo himself in the Alexandrian riots of A.D.40. It was only logical that such bitterness and fanaticism should result in destructive war and Jewish ostracism; Pharisaic righteousness and egotistical Messianism could produce patriotic martyrdom, but in this choice Judaism lost her nobler charter of Missionary to the World. (a).

The determination of official Judaism to emphasise its place among the nations as "a peculiar people" rather than act

as a cosmopolitan moral leaven,practically closed the door to that reconciliation between Judaism and Hellenism for which the Jewish-Alexandrian School as a whole had hoped and laboured. A larger sphere of service,however,and one to which neither Philo nor his predecessors would have dedicated their work in all likelihood,was found in new born Christianity,and Philo's writings,never popular with his more orthodox countrymen,more and more fell under suspicion."It is a remarkable circumstance that,whilst his ideas were acquiring a commanding position in the church,his followers were being denounced as heretics in the synagogues"(a).

Philo's lifetime falls within the period of Christianity's beginnings,but there is no indication that he had even heard of Jesus and his work.For Philo was first of all a Jew,Moses his hero,and the world wide triumph of Judaism his one aim. It would, therefore,have been both a surprise and a shock to him could he have foreseen the place and influence of his work as a preparation for the world's conquest by a faith of which he was ignorant.

He considered himself a devout orthodox Jew,and his acquain-tance with Homer,Euripedes,Plato,and the other shools of Greek philosophy,enabled him,as the leading exponent of Jewish Alexandrianism,to prove,to his own satisfaction at least,that Moses was the fountainhead from which those philosophers drew their wisdom.As pupils of the great Master he can rate them highly;he calls Plato "the Great",while Parmenides,Empedocles,Zeno,and Cleanthes are in his eyes divine and form a sacred society(b).

Of both Hebrew and Greek Scriptures his opinion as to complete inspiration was the same.They are as "Sisters,or rather as one and the same both in the facts and in the words"(Vita Mosis,

All the prophets are inspired, God's instruments of revelation, (De Monarchia, 2-222). Nor was his patriotism inferior to his love for the Law of Moses, for, although detesting politics, in the crisis of 40 A.D. he accepts the dangerous leadership of the Jewish embassy to Rome (In Flaccum, and, De leg. ad Gaium).

But Philo was too much of an eclectic in religion, too much of an Hellenist, to act as a real champion of historic Judaism." Saturated with every means of culture afforded in his age by the schools of the Greeks, in his writings Greek philosophy comes the most prominently into the foreground"(a), the result being a disintegration rather than a strengthening of his nation's faith. This phase of Philonism is emphasised, perhaps exaggerated, in Siegfried's statement: "No Jewish writer contributed so much to the dissolution of Judaism; his people's history becomes a didactic symbolic poem" (b).

In the development of his self-imposed task, the harmonization of Judaism and Hellenism, Philo wrote voluminously. While much has been lost, thanks to his popularity with the Christian Fathers enough has been preserved to exhibit the method, thought, and purpose of this chief apostle of Jewish-Alexandrianism. The larger part of his works deal with the Pentateuch, and comprise (I) "Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin et Exodum", incomplete, in the form of a catechism, and giving the literal as well as the deeper allegorical sense. (2) An elaborate esoteric and scientific "Commentary on Genesis", written for cultured Hellenistic Jews, and in which the allegorical meaning is alone unfolded, somewhat after the manner of the rabbinical Midrash, with the result that the historical narrative is ingeniously

transformed into a system of psychology and morals.At an early date it was cut up into separate fragments and issued under a variety of names.

(3) A popular digest of the Mosaic legislation for pagan readers. In this,the lengthiest as well as the "most matured and attractive of his works"(a),the allegorical method is but sparingly used,his aim throughout being to represent the laws of Moses as the best ever promulgated. (4) A number of separate treateses,including Vita Mosis,Quod omnis probus liber,In Flaccum, and De Legations ad Caium. The two last mentioned are the only extant historical works from Philo's pen,are occupied with the discussion of Jewish persecution,particularly at Alexandria,in the reign of Caligula,and,it is thought,originally formed only parts of a larger whole(b). The limits and purpose of this study forbids a more lengthy or detailed list of the more than fifty treatises ascribed to Philo,a complete and satisfactory discription of which is furnished by Schurer (c).

It is their content and its future influence upon Christian literature with which we are here concerned,yet before proceeding to a synopsis of his teaching it may be well,at this point,to pause for a brief investigation of the peculiar method of interpretation whereby Philo sought to show the best religious ideals of Greek philosophy as merely offshoots or adumbrations of the perfect revelations of Moses.

The name of Philo is almost held synonomous with Allegory, and his excessive use of it has,in these critical days,been no slight handicap in the study of his teachings. Considered as "the chief exponent of a fantastic method of interpreting documents which can scarcely excite even the archaeological interest

of the modern world, the study of Philo has suffered from a lack of proportion" (a). Yet Philo was no innovator in this use of Allegory. We have already noted the marvellous results of that method as applied by Aristobulus to the Pentateuch, and the Stoics had accomplished wonders by using it in their exegesis of Homer. That their efforts did not escape criticism is seen when Cicero taunts Chrysippus with this forced proof that the ancient poets, who had never dreamed of such things, were really Stoics (b).

Such criticism, however, had slight effect; it was an age of transition when the old must be accommodated to the new, and for this purpose Allegory has always presented itself as a competent instrument (c). Just, then, as the Stoic critic professed, by way of Allegory, to uncover the secret and supreme values of Homer and Hesiod, so Philo applied the method to the Old Testament's statements, assuming that "the form in which these narratives were clothed is only the external husk of Divine truth which lies concealed within. It is the task of the wise man to break open this husk and to show the world what depths of heavenly manna lie unfolded in the simplest statements of Holy Writ" (d).

Allegorism is then a definite protest against bald literalism, on the one hand, and a challenge to develop the deeper and spiritual. By way of this comparison it naturally is assumed to be the nobler and truer exegesis, and it is in this character that Philo accepts its leadership (De Plant. 32 ff, & De Fuga. 54f). To him, therefore, as to Origen later, Allegory was no mere human device or system but a veritable endowment of the spirit of God. But this conviction on the part of those who employed it cannot blind their readers to the fact that as a mode of Bible exegesis

Allegory opens the door for the introduction of unlimited speculation. For Philo allegory furnished the Trojan Horse whereby Hellenism was given possession of the Mosaic Law,and that law then exhibited to Greeks as the source of all their own wisdom!

Siegfried's account of the elaborate system of rules governing Philo in his exegesis is very impressive(a),but they do not appear to have offered much restraint when he sought to abstract from the Scripture whatever seemed likely to eliminate the vulgar and present the philosophical.His description of the four rivers of Paradise as representing the four Greek cardinal virtues is at least suggestive,but when Tamar(Gen.38) is represented as the soul widowed from sensual delights,we see how recklessly allegory could be utilised.Free to follow one'e own subjective ideals neither Scripture's historical sense nor its vaunted verbal inspiration need present any obstacles to such a method, and thus Philo was enabled,while sincerely reverencing the letter of the law,"to extract the leading psychological and ethical theories of Greek philosophy from three chapters in Genesis"(b). Thus Pythagorean reverence for numbers,Platonic dualism,and Stoic morals,besides its Logos doctrine,are paraded by Philo as part and parcel of the all-embracing Mosaic wisdom!

It is evident then that allegory,so far from destroying reverence for the letter,really magnifies it!The richness of the allegorical kernel adds to the lustre and value of an apparently commonplace shell,as is illustrated by the reception of the Song of Songs into the Hebrew Canon,-after it had been allegorized by Rabbi Akiba (c). Mechanical inspiration invites,even demands,such treatment,so that the words of Lipsius have point when he says of such a theory and allegory they"always go hand in hand"(d).

As in the case of Philo so with all other allegorical commentators,whatever seems of most importance to them must also have been so regarded by the sacred writer.Philo's main interest was in psychology and ethics,but had it been in the realm of astronomy his allegorical method would have worked equally well.Used with discretion it has produced many inspiring views of truth,and as an eradicator of stumbling blocks in the scriptures it naturally obtained immense popularity,but its extravagant use is also too manifest,not only in Philo,but in the Epistle of Barnabas and in much of the exegesis of Origen as well.

Allegorism was admittedly an esoteric mode of interpretation. Philo describes it as "the mystic ritual",and those fit to receive it as "initiates"(Leg.All.3.209),while in his comment on the sacrifice of Isaac he declares that the spiritual meaning of the story is only revealed to those who possess "the power of vision" (De Abr.200). The faults of allegorism were,however,those of the times,so that,until the date of the Reformation,it retained its high character as a special mode of insight into the deeper meaning of scripture. To Calvin,stern and exact literalist,it was an introduction of Satan's into the church for the purpose of rendering the doctrine of scripture ambiguous(a),while Luther,with his customary forceful bluntness,declares "Origen's allegories are not worth so much dirt"(b).Yet so alluring is the method that we discover its use in the writings of both these doughty champions of literalism (c).

But it is a far cry from Philo to the Reformation, and his greatness must not be measured by the methods used as by the positive contributions he made to early Christianity.To this end we shall now present a brief sketch of his doctrinal teaching.

"Rightly to apprehend this,it is necessary to bear in mind that Philo was not only an Old Testament exegete ,but also a Greek philosopher,and that his philosophy is conveyed in no clear-cut, coherent system,but in the form of Biblical exposition"(a). The task of discovering and arranging systematically his principal teachings,as scattered throughout such a tangled field of philosophy and scripture,fused(or confused) by the magic of allegory, is beyond the capacity of an ordinary student of his writings, therefore the following brief outline will represent,mostly,the synopsis as given by Schurer,an unquestioned master in the study of Philonic literature(b).

It is the purpose of this study to emphasise the influence of the Jewish-Alexandrian school upon the Alexandrian school of Christianity,and a birds-eye view of Philo's religious philosophy furnishes a simple yet direct means of judging how far and to what extent his concepts entered into and became a fundamental part of this development in Christian theology.

The fundamental thought from which Philo starts is that of the dualism of God and the world.The Infinite alone is Good, the finite is imperfect.His God,when he speaks as a philosopher, is a metaphysical Absolute of whom nothing can be affirmed but that He is." We can only say that He is,not what He is"(Vita Mosis). "In thus denying all attributes to God,Philo has in view,however, merely to represent Him as devoid of all limitation and imperfection.As a religious thinker it was impossible for him to rest content with palpable agnosticism,and so we find him,in spite of the contradiction involved,making definite pronouncements concerning the nature of God based upon His relation to the world" (c)."All perfection is combined in God,and derived from Him,

He fills and comprises everything"(Leg.Alleg.I-52,De Som.I-630). "All perfection in the creature is derived solely and only from Him"(Leg.Alleg.I-44).

Yet in the work of creation and beneficence the Absolutely Pure and Perfect One cannot come into direct contact with the Imperfect(De sacrif.I3),hence the necessity for Intermediaries. Such a class of intermediary Forces or Forms was no novelty to one familiar with the Platonic Ideas,the Stoic Causes,the Jewish doctrine of angels,and that of the Greek daemons,and with the growing belief in a transcendent Being the service of such a ministry was no longer merely supplementary but mandatory.

What then are some of the characteristics of Philo's "logoi"?The spiritual types of things(DeMundo.Op.I-4),the active causes or powers to work on Matter(De Vict.Off.2-26I),His ministers(De Abram.2-I7),they are the logoi,or partial powers of universal reason(De Som.I-63I),Mosaic angels or Greek daemons(De Gigan-tibus,I-263),infinite Powers of Infinite God(De sac.Abel et Cain, I-I73),and in number unlimited(De Confus.Ling.I-43I).

Are they then Divine Emanations?This is not definitely stated although suggested(De Profug.I-575).Are they possessed of personality? Apparently not;they only exist in the Divine Mind (De Mund.Op.I-4).Yet here,as in the case of the Logos,a certain amount of independence was required by Philo's basic concept that God and the world can have no direct contact,otherwise,as Zeller points out,these logoi would simply represent Divine activity in action upon imperfect Matter'(a).

Supreme among these "powers" are two,Goodness and Might, (De Cherub.I-I44),thus emphasising Goodness as the outstanding characteristic of Deity,and again these two are reconciled and

combined in the Logos.This is the corner-stone of Philo's system."By the Logos Philo understands the power of God or the active Divine intelligence in general;he designates it as the idea which comprises all other ideas;the power which comprises all powers in itself,as the entirety of the supersensuous world,or,of the Divine powers"(a).

The Logos is neither created after the manner of finite things,nor uncreated(Quis rer.div.heres,I-501ff).He is the vice-gerent or ambassador of God(Quis rer.div.her.I-501ff),and the angel or archangel who reveals God(Leg.all.I-122;De conf.ling. I-427;De Som.I-656).He is the instrument of creation(Leg.alleg. I-106;De Cherub.I-162),identical with the Creative Word of God (Leg.Alleg.I-47;De Sac.Abel et Cain,I-165),and the world's mediatorial High Priest(De Gig.I-269;De Mig.Abram,I-452;De Profug. I-562;Vit.Mosis,2-155).

The Logos Personality is,as was noted in the case of the logoi,left undecided.On this question Dean Inge's statement is worthy of quotation:"The question of the personality of the Logos is better undiscussed.Neither Philo nor any Greek cared to define a concept which has no name in the Greek language.The Logos is the constitutive principle of human individuality;he is not himself an individual.The Logos doctrine of Philo is therefore nearer to what in Christianity became Monarchianism than to the Arianism with which it has been compared,or to Athanasian orthodoxy"(b).

With the above statement Drummond is in practical agreement(c),but it is also evident Philo's theology itself renders it necessary for his argument to assume,at one time,a personal Logos who thus preserves the aloofness of God from the finite and

the imperfect,while,at another time,in order to maintain the Divine character as the one source of all things,the Logos is presented as an impersonal principle of God at work in the world.

Philo was the first to posit,under the already known and conveniently elastic name of the Logos,a mediatorial hypostasis between God and the world,and,as an amalgam of the Logos of Greek philosophy,the Alexandrian "sophia",and the ideas bound up with the Angel of The Lord,the Wisdom of the Old Testament,as well as the Memra of Palestinian Judaism,it is a mixture of very different elements.The mysterious interaction of diverse elements which it exhibits,its Protean variety,and its elusive ambiguity lent to it so many different aspects that it appealed in some way to every serious thinker,and helped to mould the entire Christian theology of the early centuries(a).

Matter. The main source of Philo's cosmogony "seems to be Plato's Timaeus,modified by an adaptation of the Stoic conception of God and considerably affected by Jewish presuppositions(b). Matter is described as "the formless,lifeless,unmoved, unordered mass devoid of properties",from which God,by means of His intermediate Powers,formed the world(De Mund.Op.I-5;Quis rer. div.her.I-492;De Profug.I-547;De creatione principum,2-367). For Philo then creation means only the formation of the world out of previously existing matter,which matter constituted a "second principle alongside of God". Thus the eternity of matter is assumed(c),but that matter according to Philo is a positive source of evil,as asserted by Edersheim and others,appears to be largely an assumption,"not a single passage is adduced which has even the appearance of supporting it"(d).Matter then is imperfect negatively,it "possesses nothing beautiful of itself but

has the capacity of becoming all things". "It is there in its passivity, awaiting the action of the Divine artificer"(a).

Philo's doctrine of man is essentially Platonic. "He conceives the air to be peopled with souls. Those who dwell in the upper parts are the intermediaries between God and the world(De Som.I-642), but those who are nearest the earth are attracted by sense, and descend into sensible bodies"(De Gig. I-263f),(b). Thus the soul of man had pre-existence, and in nature is an emanation from God, "an inseparable fragment of that divine and blessed soul". Only the life sustaining sensitive soul originates by generation; reason, on the contrary, enters into men from without(De Mund.Op.I-I5).

But evidently Philo is too much of a Jew to rest content with the Platonic origin of souls, for when he speaks of the creation of man this doctrine totally disappears, and he follows the Scriptural statement that God breathed into man the breath of life(Quod det.pot.insid.I-206f; De Mund.Op.I-32; De Spec.leg.2-356; Quis rer.div.I-480). And what of the material body in which this breath of life dwells? The spirit's prison(De Ebriet.I-372; Leg. Alleg.I-95; De Migr.Abram,I-437), the corpse which the soul drags along(Leg.Alleg.I-I00; De Agri.Noe,I-305), the coffin or grave from which it will escape to true life(De Migr.Ab.I-438; Leg. Alleg.I-65), are typical Philonic descriptions.

Sense, as such, being evil, sin is innate in man(Vita Mosis, 2-I57), and all are affected thereby-even the child of a day(De Mutatione Nominum,I-585). Yet none are wholly destitute of visitings of the divine Spirit; he bountifully confers good things upon all, even upon the imperfect, provoking them to the zealous pursuit of virtue(Leg.Alleg.I-I3).

Philo's Ethic. The view of man thus propounded formed the basis of Philo's ethic,of which the leading principle is the rejection of the sensuous,the rooting out of the passions. He adopts the teaching of the Stoics with respect to the four cardinal virtues(Leg.Alleg.I-56),and the four passions(Leg.Alleg.I-II4), and with them considers morality the only good(De post.Caini, I-25I). But his morality differs from that of the Stoics in having a religious basis.By the help of God alone can perfection be attained(Leg.Alleg.I-58),for true morality is imitation of the Deity(De Decalogo,2*I93).

Men may live after the flesh or after the spirit,may be godless or righteous,foolish or wise.Only by surrender to divine influence can man reach his true gaol,which is The Direct or Mystic Vision of God. Man's soul being transcendental in origin so must be its final objective.Glimpses of this rapture were possible in this life(De Migr.Abr.7),and these foretastes were but assurances of the final triumph after death,when those who had walked with God should regain their original state.

But Philo's concept of God,even as that of Neo-Platonism at a later date,forbade the mortal to dwell with the immortal,hence this mystic,ecstatic vision of Deity is only possible by the quenching of the mortal's reason!"Inasmuch as the absence of thought and will amounts to the annihilation of the spiritual life,this involves the absurd conclusion that its perfection can be attained only through its destruction"(a).It is surely something of a reductio ad absurdum in spiritual things, to make such a lofty claim and then admit that in its attainment we lose all ability to enjoy it intelligently!

As Herriot has said,"This is the last word of Philo,the extreme

consequence of a method which has allegory for its starting - point,ecstacy for its favourite process,and mysticism for its result"(a).

The principal positive doctrines,then,of Philo are, briefly,(I) A Transcendental Deity without direct relation to this world.(2)Therefore a system of Intermediaries,or divine agencies,through whom divine creative power and care can be manifested.At the head of this hierarchy and a summation of it is the Logos.(3) Matter uncreated,eternal;passively,negatively evil.Out of this the divine agents created the world.(4) Man a combination of animal and spirit.The latter is divine in origin and therefore immortal.But all men are tainted by the evil of matter,yet are free to seek release from this bondage.By the exercise of Free-Will men decide their destiny. (5) The objective of the spiritual man is to regain his original condition, wherein his spirit existed before becoming entangled in matter. This is possible by the help of the Logos,and by a life of strenuous persistence in overcoming fleshly desire. He may even attain to the Mystic Vision of God Himself.

Our chief interest in Philo is not so much as a teacher of Neo-Judaism as in his influence upon Christianity,hence a brief investigation of how far the above teachings are present in the New Testament,and later in the theology of Clement and Origen,must now be undertaken as a logical development of our general study.And such an investigation will reveal as one of the strangest of religious phenomena a man to whom Christianity was unintelligible,whose only aim was the readjustment of Judaism to the New Thought,contributing,in method,theological phraseology,and in spiritual mysticism,so generously to a faith of which he seems to have been scarcely aware.

Philo and the New Testament. The extent to which the N.T. writers were acquainted with,or ignorant of,the teachings of the great Alexandrian,is,so far,a matter of surmise.The Apollos, first mentioned in Acts I8,as an Alexandrian born,might have brought to Paul and his co-workers a first hand knowledge of Philo's religious philosophy,but the N.T.references to the eloquent Alexandrian do not permit us to assume this to be a fact. Josephus,who lived and wrote during the formative period of the N.T.writings,evidently knew and appreciated Philo's work seeing he describes the latter as "a man highly distinguished and not unskilled in philosophy"(Antiq.I8.8-I),but this testimony only suggests a knowledge of Philonism among the more liberal-minded Jews.

Yet there remains one source of information as to Philo's possible influence in the writing of the New Testament,and that is the N.T.writings themselves.And from this study many leading scholars have concluded that in these writings there are sufficient coincidences of method,thought,and expression to suggest Philonic influence.If this be so,even to only a small degree,it is too important to overlook,and while the limits of this study forbids a detailed investigation,a brief summary of the principal evidences of N.T.Philonism will greatly assist in the task of evaluating the influence of the Jewish Alexandrian school upon early Christian thought.And in so doing we shall also develop the practical and historical connection between the Jewish and Christian Alexandrian schools of religious thought.

As to the scope of this summary,a survey of the earliest writings,as represented by the Pauline epistles,of the middle period,as exhibited in the epistle to the Hebrews,and of the

latest N.T.literature, as presented in the Johannine writings, is all that can be here attempted. First of all therefore let us note the similarities between Paulinism and Philonism.

Harnack is of the opinion that Philo's philosophy did not become operative among Christians until the beginning of the second century, but while valuable as an opinion it need not deter us from forming conclusions of our own(a). Thus in Gal.3-16, the apostolic emphasis upon the singular as used in Gen.22-18 reminds one of Philo's allegorical treatment of numbers; also Paul's allegorical interpretation of the name, Hagar, (Gal.4-24), evidences the apostolic tendency to utilise, occasionally, Philo's favorite mode of exegesis. Doctrinally, the parallelism can be traced in the terms in which both Philo and Paul represent the moral degradation of heathenism(Rom.I), the antagonism between "flesh" and "spirit"(Rom.7), the call to rise above the letter of the law to inward constraint by the will of God, and the longing to reach conformity to the image of the divine Mediator.

Linguistically also there are frequent similarities. When Paul speaks of "beating his body black and blue"(I Cor.9-27) it is but an echo of Philo's sentiments, and Paul's "heirs of God" is matched by Philo's description of the pious as "heirs of divine things". The Logos doctrine of Christ, as such, is not found in the Pauline writings, yet, as pointed out by Inge(b), in the later epistles of Paul we find the content if not the name. Thus in Col.I-15-19 Paul's description of the "Son" as "the image of the invisible God", the first-born of all, the creator of all, the very "pleroma" of divinity, is thoroughly in harmony with the Philonic vision of the Logos. And this is true even although Paul

is speaking of a vividly historical Person while Philo describes only an unstable philosophic concept!

One other remarkable coincidence in the spiritual aspirations of those two men deserves mention in this limited discussion,namely,their mystic experiences of direct communion with God.It has been already noted how high a place this mystical experience had held in Philo's personal religion,and how in the full vision of God lay his hopes of eternal felicity;it is therefore of considerable interest to remember how frequently the New Testament narrative records similar spiritual experiences on the part of Paul.A summary of the principal N.T.references to these Pauline "ecstacies"will sufficiently illustrate this point. Acts 22-6,23-9,26-13,9-3,16-6,18-9,1 Cor.9-1,2 Cor.12-1,Gal.2-2, and Eph.3-3.Thus while it cannot be shown that the younger man is directly indebted to the older it is evident that they had much in common and often drank from the same fount of religious truth.

If,following E.F.Scott(a),it is assumed that the Epistle to The Hebrews was written about the year 85,A.D.,then it is easy to see why this writer-a Hellenist,whoever he may have been-exhibits a larger acquaintance with and use of Philonic methods and phraseology than Paul.Moffatt holds that "the reminiscenses of Philo in Hebrews are obvious"(b),giving as illustrations the use of the allegorical method(cf.Leg.Alleg.3-25 with Heb.7-2),the same belief in the verbal inspiration of the Septuagint,and the same phraseology about the Logos(though the conception is naturally different).While the author never directly applies the term "Logos" to Christ,possibly because there was still a prejudice against it,none the less the opening verses of the Epistle,which

tell of the Son through whom God created all things and who was "the effulgence of his glory and the impress of his substance", are couched in the very language of Philo(a). Philo's emphasis upon the priestly character of the Logos(De Migr.Abr) is paralleled in Hebrews by the primary importance given to that aspect of Christ's work,while the shadowy nature of things seen as compared with the unseen,as taught by both,reveals a common Platonic reverence for the Ideal.Philo and this author alike find a religious significance in the silences of the Old Testament(Heb.7-3 and Quis rer.div.12),and the titles of Melchisedek are suggestive of religious truths to both(Cf Heb.7-1ff with Leg.Alleg.3-25).

An almost certain proof that the author of Hebrews was acquainted with the writings of Philo is found in the fact that the quotation(or misquotation!) in Hebrews 13-5 occurs only, in this form,in De confus.ling.32,and this,with other significant coincidences for which there is no place here,leads one to think that Drummond may be overly cautious in his statement that "it is probable that the resemblances are due to the general condition of religious culture among the Jews"(b). Kennedy takes stronger ground for the Philonic influence in this book when he suggests the probability that Philo's insistence upon the priestly character of the Logos was one of the factors which set the Priest-hood of Christ in the centre of the Epistle,"a document whose Alexandrian and Philonic associations are evident throughout"(c). And with this opinion the general facts seem to agree.

"The Alexandrian influence,which is clearly traceable in the Epistle to the Hebrews,is still more pronounced in the Fourth Gospel and the kindred Epistles of John"(d). Written at the end of the first century or in the first decade of the second

by "the disciple whom Jesus loved" the time was ripe for a more philosophic presentation of the life and work of Jesus in terms of Hellenism and its religious concepts. Already the Gnostic leaven had begun to work and the divinity of Jesus was being emphasised at the expense of his humanity. In the preceding studies we have seen the approach of Paul and the author of Hebrews towards the Logos ideal of Christ; in the Johannine writings it is boldly introduced as the key to the situation.

In Ephesus and in most of the Greek centres of Asia Minor the Logos of Stoicism represented a certain form of Deity to devotees of that philosophic system of religion. But as such it had too much of a pantheistic nature to have fitted the specific personality of the Christian Jesus. But as modified and spiritualised by Philo in connecting the term with the O.T. Wisdom and Rabbinic Memra the word had come to mean all those divine qualities attributed to Christ by his followers, while its attachment to the human, historic personality of Jesus supplied the one principal quality lacking in Philo's presentation. This mediation of the Alexandrian Jewish philosopher was more than incidental, it was necessary as a preliminary to the adoption of this term into the place of highest Christian honour.

That the religious implications of the word, Logos, were well known at that date is suggested by the fact that the Gospel writer uses it without any explanation; that he is well acquainted with Philonian thought and phraseology is revealed by the other fact that "almost the whole Gospel Prologue could be paralleled in Philo" (a). Furthermore, while recalling the obvious fact that the Johannine content of the term is very different from that of Philo, the Logos idea of the Gospel, as set forth in the Prologue, controls

the whole presentation of the Christ life given by this Gospel. While the author "does not find Jesus in the Logos but the Logos in the Jesus of the church"(a),yet he never permits his readers to forget that here is a man Divine,ever conscious of his divinity,and carrying on his work according to a divine plan.

He is self-determining(2.I-II,7.I-II,IO.I5-I8,I8.4-7); omniscient(5.42,8.40f);the Passion has the marks of a royal progress(I4.2f,I6.5f);he carries his own cross(I9.I7).Nevertheless, the Johannine Jesus is no docetic Christ,he is still subject to weariness(4.6),to grief(II.36),to joy and indignation(I8.20). Thus the Logos in the flesh is not the Philonic Logos,nor could it be according to his philosophic dualism,yet the Gospel development of the Logos doctrine requires Philonism as a fitting background,and,according to Inge,"will be unintelligible without it"(b).

Nor is the Logos doctrine the only point of convergence between those two thinkers.Thus I.I8 is a thought found in Philo (De mut.nom.2),and the Logos Christ in his miraculous creation of new wine(2.I-II) fulfils the role of Philo's Melchisedek,the prototype of the Logos(Leg.Alleg.3.26). The six waterpots(2.6) from which the wine was produced correspond to the Philonic principle that "six is the most productive of numbers"(Decalogo, 30),and Philo's Logos is also both omniscient and a teacher(Leg. Alleg.3.59,Quod Deus sit immut.28).Jesus as the bread of life (6.35f) is a reproduction of Philo's identification of the manna with the Logos(De profug.25),and with John I5.I5 we may compare the Philonic original in the comment on Gen.I8.I7(De sobrietate,II)."These instances show that in literary methods, no less than in religious speculation,the Fourth evangelist had

been trained in the Philonic spirit rather than in the Hermetic piety"(a).

Philo's influence upon Judaism,it has been already noted, in the increasingly hostile attitude between Jew and Gentile, was but slight. Josephus furnishes several instances of seeming dependence(b),and Siegfried points out traces of Philonic influence in later Jewish exegesis(c). That Philo's religious philosophy was not without effect upon later developments of Greek religious thought is evident in the teachings found in the "Opera Moralia"by Plutarch,in the Neo-Pythagoreanism of Apollonius of Tyana,and in the Neo-Platonic doctrines of a transcendental Deity and man's possible union with Him by way of the Mystic Vision(d).

But of such interesting developments our limits forbid more than this passing notice. Nor is it necessary to do more than state in general terms Philo's widespread popularity with the Christian Fathers of early Christianity.It must suffice here to sum it up in the comprehensive yet brief statement by Fairweather:"The Greek Fathers of the first century,in particular Barnabas;the Greek Apologists of the second century(Justin Martyr, Tatian,Athenagoras,etc.);the Alexandrians of the second and third centuries(Clement,Origen,etc.);the Gnostics(Cerinthus,Valentinus, Simon Magus,etc.),and their opponents(Irenaeus,Tertullian,etc.); the Church historian Eusebius of Caesarea;and even the leading Greek theologians of later times(Basil the Great,Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom,etc.) have all,more or less,borrowed from Philo(e).

The Latin Fathers,though in a less degree,also found in his writings a rich mine of useful material;even the learned Jerome is indebted to him,while "Ambrose conveys whole sentences from him into his writings"(f) and so earns from a Jewish writer

the title "Philo Christianus"(a)! That the influence of this Jewish-Alexandrian religious philosopher was therefore unique is beyond question;that it was detrimental as well as helpful is equally evident.His contribution of the Logos doctrine with its suggestion of a mode of distinction in the Divine Unity was undoubtedly an aid in the development of Christian Christology, and yet,as Benn remarks,it may have contained the seeds of that Logos character gradually conferred upon both the church and Bible -a concept which was and is still a distinct handicap to the kingdom of Christ!

Of his own spirituality and love of truth there is much to be said,indeed herein lies his extraordinary fascination upon religious minds,then and now." The chief impression made upon one by a careful reading and re-reading of his works is the extraordinary vitality of his religious interest,the depth of his religious experience.This seems to be of central value for understanding the man himself,and for estimating his bearing on Christianity" (b). "Yet when all due weight is given to this aspect of the subject,it is true of Philo as it was of Plato that his religion is that of the few-that of the philosopher and the ascetic"(c). The truth of this estimate is confirmed by his own words:"There are few whose ears are open to receive these sacred words which teach that it belongs to God alone to sow and to create what is good"(De Mut.Nom.I38).

The Epistle of Barnabas

"The Epistle of Barnabas is interesting from being the first attempt to explain, after the fashion prevalent in Alexandria, the theological relation of the Old and New Covenants, and also by the evidence it affords in its latter portion of the existence of a rudimentary Christian catechism or scheme of duty, of which the Didache gives the earliest example" (a).

In its excessive use of the allegorical method of Bible interpretation this curious treatise seems to have appealed strongly to the Christian Fathers of Alexandria, hence we find that Clement "has no hesitation in ascribing the epistle to Barnabas, and Origen, in his treatise against Celsus, calls it "the Catholic epistle of Barnabas" (b), and elsewhere seems to rank it among the Sacred Scriptures (c). Thus endorsed it later appears among the Antilegomena of Eusebius, and Jerome, while classifying it as apocryphal, yet appears to consider it the work of St. Barnabas (d). In the Codex Sinaiticus this epistle is found with the books of the New Testament, and during the early centuries was, along with such writings as "The Shepherd of Hermas" and Clement's "First Epistle", in considerable use as "edifying" literature.

But despite this strong endorsement of its authenticity this epistle was refused a place in the New Testament Canon. For this final decision there were several good reasons. Outside of the mere statements of the Alexandrian Fathers there was no evidence that Barnabas wrote it. The epistle itself makes no such claim, an omission which the writer, so fond of emphasising his special equipment in "gnosis", would not likely perpetrate.

Granting that the writer's name was Barnabas,which was likely enough,there was sufficient time between the writing and the end of the second century to have him identified with the famous companion of St Paul. And such was the popular tendency of that age.

But the decisive objection lies in the contents of the epistle itself.Its foolish and trivial allegories(e.g.Ch.IO),the self-importance of the writer as a revealer of specially uplifting truths (see end of ch.9),his lack of accuracy in chapters 7 and 8 concerning the Jewish ceremonies,and his anti-Judaic attitude, so different from that of Paul,are considerations fatal to the authorship of Barnabas or any other Apostle (a).While therefore it is generally granted that the epistle originated in Alexandria,its most likely author was some Jewish-Alexandrian layman, probably a recent convert to Christianity,and thus zealously opposed to all the higher claims of Judaism.

The date of its composition is not entirely settled,although most recent writers place it in the time of Trajan or Hadrian. Cruttwell and Hamilton,however,building upon data supposedly found in the Daniel passages of chapter 4, attempt to show that it belongs to the reign of Vespasian(b),but the reference to a rebuilding of the temple,in chapter I6,provides a stronger argument in favour of the former date. Rainy's statement that "this epistle should be dated high in the second century,perhaps in the earlier part of the reign of Hadrian"(c) may be accepted as reflecting the general consensus of opinion on this point.

The purpose of the epistle,no matter by whom or where written, is to impart what is described as valuable Gnosis(see ch.I), namely,the true view of the Old Testament,and especially of the

former

Jewish law.Those days preceding the despairing Jewish struggle under Barcochab against Roman rule(A.D.I32-I35) must have been years marked by the bitterest anatgonism between Jew and Jewish-Christian,a time when personal feelings warped and discoloured one's theology!Thus the epistle of Barnabas is more of an emotional than a theological attack upon Judaism.

Unable to restrain himself within the bounds laid down by Paul or the author of Hebrews in their judgement of the Old Dispensation,this writer arbitrarily assumes that from the very beginning the Jewish ceremonial observances were all a mistake, in so doing they were deceived and led astray by "an evil angel" (ch.9).By assuming that his own allegorical interpretation was the one and only mode of reading the Old Testament,aided by a profusely arbitrary use of texts(Chs.I3-I6),he blots out the Jewish church from the spiritual landscape,for the only Divine revelation ever given was the Christian!"In establishing this thesis Barnabas betrays the unsoundness of his critical method. It is wholly subjective"(a). In fact,just as he boasts of a special Gnosis so does he exhibit a certain partnership in that reckless handling of the Old Testament so characteristic of Gnosticism.As a Christian writer his attitude towards the Old Testament is succinctly stated by Hort:"The Epistle of Barnabas, whenever it may have been written,is a striking example of what the Apostolic teaching about the old Covenant was <u>not</u>"(b).

Apart from the last three chapters,which are largely a mere reproduction of the Didache's teaching on the Two Ways, the Epistle of Barnabas,does,however,contain many beautiful passages of considerable spiritual insight,e.g.chapters 4 and I6,

yet so embedded are such gems in the masses of puerile allegorisms that Cruttwell's remark is very much to the point,"the conclusions are sound and spiritual,but the process absurd,and the iteration wearisome"(a).

Before closing this brief study it should be noted that the author's quotation,in chapter 4,of Matt.20-16,or,22-14,is the first example in the writings of the Fathers of a citation from any book of the New Testament preceded by the authoritative formula "it is written",also,that in chapter 5 he describes the apostles (before their call) as "sinners above all sin",i.e.as extraordinary sinners,a statement quoted,and apparently approved, by Origen (b),and,finally,that in chapter 15 he agrees with the Gospel of Peter when he affirms that Christ's resurrection took place on the eighth day,which day therefore "we keep with joyfulness".

Altogether,then,one finds in this epistle a rare jumble of genuine piety,Gnostic conceit,a lack of knowledge or respect for apostolic teaching,and a literary expression that is turgidly commonplace. Compared with the genuine N.T.writings this treatise is decidedly inferior spiritually,intellectually,and as a literary production,and when contrasted with the writings of the great Alexandrines,Clement and Origen,about the only common feature discoverable is that it too is allegorically Alexandrine. In naming Barnabas as its author the Alexandrines were paying no compliment to that great man,while by refusing it a place in the N.T.Canon the Church exercised a wise judgement.It is therefore valuable "as shewing the manner in which a Christian teacher wrote shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem,and the Church's discrimination between inspired and uninspired writings"(c).

Notes and References on Chapter 2.

Page I.
(a) Schurer, "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3, Div.2, p.322.
(b) Morrison, "The Jews Under Roman Rule", p.395.

Page 2.
(a) Drummond, "Philo Judaeus", vol.I, p.7.
(b) Mommsen, "Provinces of The Roman Empire", vol.2, p.I84.
(c) Drummond, "Philo Judaeus", vol.I, p.IO.
(d) Ibid, pp.II-I2.

Page 3.
(a) Fairweather, "Background of The Gospels", p.352.
(b) Schurer, "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3, Div.2, p.322.
(c) Philo, "De spec.leg.", 3.4-6.
(d) Kennedy, "Philo's Contribution to Religion", p.6.
(e) Morrison, "The Jews Under Roman Rule", p.357.

Page 4.
(a) Morrison, "The Jews Under Roman Rule", pp.357ff.

Page 5.
(a) Morrison, "The Jews Under Roman Rule", p.400.
(b) Schurer, "The Jewish People in The Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3, Div.2, p.364.

Page 6.
(a) Schurer, "The JewishPeople in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3, Div.2, p.363
(b) Inge, "Ency. Ethics and Religion", Art, "Alexandrian Theology" vol.I.

Page 7.
(a) Ewald, "History of Israel", vol.7, p.225.
(b) Fairweather, "Jesus and the Greeks", pp.I68-I69.
(c) Schurer, "The Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ", vol.3, Div.2, pp.323-36I.

Page 8.
(a) Kennedy, "Philo's Contribution to Religion", p.5.
(b) Cicero, "De natura deorum", Book I, Sec.I5.
(c) Fosdick, "The Modern Use of The Bible", pp.65ff.
(d) Morrison, "The Jews Under Roman Rule", pp.397-398.

Page 9.
(a) Siegfried, "Philon von Alexandrien", p.I68ff.
(b) Fairweather, "The Background of The Gospels", p.354.
(c) Fosdick, "The Modern Use of The Bible", p.7I.
(d) In Schenkel's Bibel Lexicon, I.p.9I.

Page IO.
(a.b.c.) Fosdick, "The Modern Use of The Bible", pp.83-88.

Notes and References on Chapter 2(Cont.).

Page II.
(a) Fairweather,"Jesus and The Greeks",p.I87.
(b) Schurer,"The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", vol.3,Div.2,pp.370-380.
(c) Fairweather,"Jesus and The Greeks",p.I88.

Page I2.
(a) Zeller,"Greek Philosophy",vol.3,Div.2,p.365.

Page I3.
(a) Zeller,"Greek Philosophy",vol.3,div.2,p.37I.
(b) Inge",Ency.of Religion and Ethics"vol.I,Art. "Alexandrian Theology".
(c) Drummond,"Philo Judaeus",vol.2,p.226.

Page I4.
(a) Fairweather,"Jesus and The Greeks",pp.I90-I9I.
(b) Kennedy,"Philo's Contribution to Religion",p63.
(c) Drummond,"Philo Judaeus",vol.I,p.307.
(d) Ibid,p.3II.

Page I5.
(a) Kennedy,"Philo's Contribution to Religion",pp.66-67.
(b) Fairweather,"The Background of The Gospels",p.359.

Page I6.
(a) Fairweather,"Jesus and The Greeks",p.I95.

Page I7.
(a) Herriot,"Philon le Juif",p.I99.

Page I9.
(a) Fairweather,"Jesus and The Greeks", p.2I0.
(b) Inge,"Ency.of Ethics and Religion",vol.8,Art."Logos".

Page 20.
(a) E.F.Scott,"First Age of Christianity",p.2I3.
(b) Moffatt,"Introd.to The Lit.of The New Testament",p.27.

Page 2I.
(a) Scott,"First Age of Christianity",p.2I5.
(b) Drummond,"Philo Judaeus",vol.I,p.I2.
(c) Kennedy,"Philo's Contribution to Religion",p.I62.
(d) Scott,"The First Age of Christianity",p.2I7.

Page 22.
(a) Inge,"Ency.of Religion and Ethics",vol.8,Art."Logos".

Page 23.
(a) Moffatt,"Introd.to The Lit.of The N.T.",p.525.
(b) Inge,"Ency.of Relig.and Ethics",vol.8,Art."Logos".

Notes and References on Chapter 2 (Cont.).

Page 24.

(a) Moffatt,"Introd.to The Literature of The New Testament" p.525.
(b) Josephus,"Pref to Ant",&"Ant.3.7.7.
(c) Siegfried,"Philo von Alexandria",p.281ff.
(d) Fairweather,"Jesus and The Greeks",pp.197-201.
Bigg ,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",pp.10&23.
(e) Fairweather,"Jesus and The Greeks",p.212.
(f) Inge,"Ency.of Religion and Ethics",vol.I, Art."Alexandrian Theology".

Page 25.

(a) "Jewish Encyclopedia", Art."Ambrose".
(b) Kennedy,"Philo's Contribution to Religion",Pref.p.8.
(c) Fairweather,"Jesus and The Greeks", p.215.

The Epistle of Barnabas

Page 26.

(a) Cruttwell,"A Literary History of Early Christianity", vol.I,p.26.
(b) Foakes-Jackson,"The History of The Christian Church", p.97.
Refs.in note:Clem.of Alex."Strom.2.7,35,&c; Origen, Adv.Celsum,bk.I,ch.63;Euseb.H.E.3.25 &6.13-14; Jerome,de Vir Illus.c.6."
(c) Origen,"Comm.in Rom".I.24".
(d) Jerome,"de vir.illus."c.6.

Page 27.

(a) Cruttwell,"A Literary History of Early Christianity", vol.I,p.48.
(b) Ibid. p.49.
Hamilton,"Dict.of The Apostolic Church",Art."Barnabas".
(c) Rainy,"The Ancient Catholic Church",p.55.

Page 28.

(a) Cruttwell,"A Literary Hist.of Early Christianity", vol.I,P.53.
(b) Hort,"Judaistic Christianity",p.191.

Page 29.

(a) Cruttwell,"A Literary History of Early Christianity", vol.I,p.53.
(b) Origen,"Contra Celsum",bk.I.63.For this estimate of the apostles the N.T. references are Luke 5.8,&I Tim.I.15. -rather a small basis for such a sweeping statement.
(c) Foakes-Jackson,"History of The Christian Church",p.100.

The Christian School of Alexandria.

Chapter 3.

Clement- Christian Gnostic.

The Christian School of Alexandria.

Chapter 3.

Clement,-Christian Gnostic.

It is not at all improbable that Christianity had found its first foothold in Alexandria before the death of Philo. "According to the earliest tradition, that which is preserved in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies, Christianity was first preached in the streets of Alexandria by Barnabas"(a), although the more popular story is that St Mark, the interpreter of Peter, was the founder of the Alexandrian church, and its most distinguished martyr(b).

In any case the Christian membership of that church, a membership recruited to some extent from Alexandrian Judaism doubtless, must have had from the beginning considerable acquaintance with that Philonic religious philosophy which, in later years, contributed so powerfully to the organization of Christian doctrine, and, in a lesser degree, to the religious vagaries of Gnosticism, as well as furnishing some of the content to Neo-Platonism.

The basic value of the Jewish-Alexandrian religious philosophy for Christians lay in its reverence for the Old Testament. Moses and the prophets were given precedence over Greek philosophy, and although this profession was too largely adulterated by the use of allegory, yet in a city so hospitable to all philosophic theories, and especially devoted to the great thinkers of Greece, this fundamental assumption of the supremacy of the Old Testament furnished a strong anchorage against the sweep and pull of the popular currents of thought so characteristic of a city noted for its freedom of thought and its intellectual endowments.
In such an atmosphere divergences from apostolic Christianity

were certain to occur,and so we find that Alexandria became a notable centre of that form of heresy known in history as (Judaistic) Gnosticism,the beginnings of which had attracted the attention of both Paul and John (a). "Their aim was to reduce Christianity to a philosophy,and a leading feature in their creeds was Oriental dualism,which was largely mingled,especially in Egypt and Asia Minor,with Greek philosophical and religious thought"(b). The most famous leaders of the Alexandrian Gnostics were Basilides(C.I30 A.D.),Valentinus(C.I50 A.D.),Herakleon,who wrote a commentary on John,and Bardesanes.

While the Gnostics were still sapping at the church foundations from within the religious-philosophic revival,later to emerge as Neo-Platonism, but first a combination of the Pythagorean philosophy and Platonism,was already shaping itself into the form of a powerful rival to the Christian faith. The leaders in this preliminary stage of Neo-Platonism were Plutarch,Galen the physician,Celsus the opponent of Christianity,and Numenius of Apamea(c),but the founder of Neo-Platonism as such was the philosopher,Ammonius Saccas,who,otherwise unknown,holds a secure niche in the hall of Fame as teacher of Plotinus,Neo-Platonist, and Origen,Christian scholar,theologian,and exegete.

Thus situated amid powerful currents of Oriental and Occidental religious philosophies the church at Alexandria was literally compelled to adapt her defence of the faith to the unique conditions of the empire's intellectual capital",If Christianity was to succed in holding its own among so vast a host of competitors,it must be either by showing that it possessed the key by which their results might be interpreted,or by including their partial truths in a fuller and more universal truth of its

own"(a). "Philo and his predecessors had to a great extent paved the way for a systematised expression,in terms of Greek philosophy,of the contents of Jewish-Christian tradition"(b). "All the elements of Christian theology,except the history of Christ,were already prepared in the religious and philosophical eclecticism of Philo and other Jewish Hellenists"(c).

To the Christian thinkers of Alexandria the religious developments of the second century demanded that they either should accept Greek philosophy as an ally or denounce it as the invention of the devils.The wild speculations of the Gnostics had brought about a violent Christian reaction against all heathen learning.Irenaeus characterises it as "superfluous and fallacious",Tatian pours fierce derision upon the Schools,and Tertullian joins Hermias in the assertion that "Greek Science is the bridal gift of the fallen Angels to the daughters of men"(d).Nor was this unfavourable opinion of heathen philosophy wanting in the membership of the Alexandrian church;the ruling party there was that of the Orthodoxasts,whose watchword was "Only believe",an attitude toward learning which furnished Celsus with some real foundation for his charge that Christianity was the preferred refuge for the ignorant and unthinking(e).

The adoption of Greek learning,therefore,as the handmaid and servant of Christian thought was by no means a popular policy;it required no little courage to initiate and persist in a course which laid them open to the suspicions and aspersions of their more timid and more narrowminded brethren.The church owes then no slight debt to Pantaenus,Clement,Origen,and their successors in the Alexandrian School,who had the vision of All Truth as One,and who,in the time of greatest need,constituted

themselves the defenders and exponents of scientific religion. Whether or not this introduction of Greek mataphysics into the Christian doctrinal system was an advantage or not must always present material for argument;it is,however,difficult to imagine how otherwise the Greek world,and especially the learned element of that world,could have been induced to embrace the new faith, and while it may be admitted that Greek philosophy was given too great prominence in the combination,yet in view of the needs of that age,one may well hesitate before endorsing the somewhat hysterical statement by Hatch "that metaphysical theology has been a "damnosa hereditas"(a).

It is,however,not to the Church of Alexandria as such but to its Catachetical School that credit must be given for this momentous transformation of primitive Christianity. From the earliest dawn of Christianity the greatest attention had been paid to the instruction of converts preparatory to baptism,and doubtless it was in such educative work that the Alexandrian Catechetical School had its origin.The first hundred years of its history are lost in obscurity,it is only after 175 A.D.when Pantaenus took charge,that the School begins to assume importance as a theological centre.

Until the time of Bishop Demetrius,as arrogant in his ecclesiasticism as he was ignorant of scholarship,the School was practically independent of the church.Rather it was an answer to the popular demands for an advanced course of Christian instruction for the unusually well-educated enquirers of intellectual Alexandria.Even after Demetrius had despoiled his church of her long cherished democracy and assumed autocratic control over the School(b),the institution still retained a

certain independence," and existed side by side with the church organization as a sort of informal Chair of Apologetics"(a).

"Philip of Side, writing in the sixth century, says that Athenagoras was the founder of the Catechetical School of Alexandria, but this is very doubtful"(b). The first head of this school that we know of with any certainty was a converted Stoic philosopher named Pantaenus." Of his personal history little is known. According to Photius, his teachers were men who had seen the apostles. Jerome represents him as an extensive (allegorical) commentator, and as having discovered a Hebrew version of St Matthew's Gospel during a missionary journey to the East. Ignorant as we are as to the particular nature of his teaching we know that he was the first to give to the Alexandrian school its distinctive character as one that mingled philosophy with religious instruction"(c). He was succeeded by his own pupil, the better known Titus Flavius Clemens, about the year 189 A.D.

Clement of Alexandria.

Titus Flavius Clemens was a Greek, and probably an Athenian(d). Born of heathen parents about the middle of the second century his ample means enabled him to acquire a thorough classical education. After he came under Christian influences he continued his search for truth, wandering in many lands in search of the wisest and most helpful teachers. To these we find grateful allusions in the first chapter of his Stromateis, but he did not obtain the desired rest of spirit until, in Alexandria, he came upon Pantaenus, "the true Sicilian bee, gathering spoils from the flowers of the prophetic and apostolic meadow"(e).

Here then he made his home, received ordination(f), and at the

call of duty took the place of his beloved master, as teacher of the Alexandrian Catechetical School. Here he remained for about fourteen years of unique service for the Church, not the least of which was that, when driven from Alexandria by the persecution under Severus, which temporarily broke up the School, he provided in his pupil, Origen, such a successor as was fully capable of adding to the glory of the institution and giving the Christian Church its first systematic theology.

After the date of his flight from Egypt (202-203 A.D.) Clement practically disappears from history. Tradition has it that he spent the rest of his life in Palestine, chiefly in the society of his old pupil, Alexander of Jerusalem, and the last notice of his life is that found in a letter of recommendation given him by Alexander to the church in Antioch, in the year 213 A.D.(a). The time and place of his death are unknown.

"It is not an eventful biography. Clement was essentially a man of letters, and his genial contemplative temper rendered him averse to direct controversy. In later times he was considered a marvel of learning, for the range of his acquaintance with Greek literature, ecclesiastical, Gnostic, and classical, was varied and extensive" (b). This erudition was subordinated by Clement to the glory of Christ, to him Reason as well as Revelation was the servant of the Logos, to the thoughtful heathen Science had been a covenant of God, it had justified them as the Law justified the Jews (c). To his great contemporary, Tertullian, to "search for truth is a confession of apostasy" (d), but Clement strenuously asserted not only the merits of Philosophy in the past but its continuous necessity in the Church. The abuses of the Gnostic treatment were but a challenge to him not to hand over the riches

of the Greek world of intellect to those enemies of the Church, but,on the contrary," to restore philosophy to its true place by substituting for the false gnosis of Basilides and Valentinus a true churchly gnosis which should do justice to the Old and New Testaments alike"(a).

At this distance in time Gnosticism may seem to us a mere academic discussion of religion,but at the end of the second century its power and influence were a very real threat to apostolic Christianity.Claiming to represent intellectual Christianity the Gnostics made their special appeal to the educated classes both within and outside the church of that day. It was really a claim of human philosophy,a combination of both Oriental and Greek,to re-mold and dominate Christianity,and the fact that such a system-or systems-could pose as Christian at all,is evidence enough that,so far,the Christian church had paid but slight attention to the task of clearly defining her doctrinal standards.

The conflict with Gnosticism was therefore a serious crisis in the history of our faith.Gwatkin calls attention to four great crises in church history when Christianity has had to re-adjust herself and her teachings to meet new demands.Gnosticism and Arianism,in the early centuries,and the Reformation, with the unique development of scientific knowledge in recent years,are those outstanding occasions in Christian history,the conflict with each requiring a new revelation of Jesus(b). In the case of Gnosticism the church was compelled in self-defence to begin a more definite formulation of its beliefs,as well as a statement of what made up its scriptural Canon.

Alexandria,as we have seen,was a main centre of the

Gnostic school of thought;it was fitting therefore that here it should receive its death blow(a).The polemics of Irenaeus and Tertullian clearly showed the absurdity of the Gnostic claim to call itself Christian,although the latter in his "De Praescriptione Hereticorum" presents such a violently prejudiced argument as to fairly justify Dr Hort in calling that presentation "a most plausible and mischievous book"(b).All philosophy is ruled out of court;all investigation is practically excluded:" What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?"(c).

With Clement,however,the Alexandrian School adopted a different and a more positive mode of attack.Instead of denouncing as of the devil the philosophical elements of Gnosticism Clement appropriates their stock in trade.His cure for Gnosticism was not less knowledge but more.To him "Christianity was the crown of all worthy human thoughts:it was a creed in harmony with all that men had found to be valid,supplying all that men had felt to be lacking".(d).Such were Clement's convictions;by instruction and writing he sought to commend them to others; and in so doing he set the type of the earlier Alexandrian teaching.For him,as for Philo,philosophy is not a gift of the devils but of God through the Logos,whose light ever beams upon his earthly imsge,the intelligence of man."Like the burning glass its power of kindling is borrowed from the sun"(e). Thus in the great crisis presented by the inroads of Gnosticism Clement and his successors at Alexandria contribute to Christian thought the inspiring concept of Christ as the sanctifier of <u>All</u> knowledge.

Clement's age was one of transition,of pioneering, and as such ought not to be judged by the standards of later

churchly decisions.It would be a great mistake to imagine that the post-apostolic age started with the fulness of the apostolic teaching as that is embodied in the New Testament.Elementariness is the signature of all the early literature,a general expectation of the speedy second coming of Christ diverted the minds of Christians from any systematizing in theology. It was the alarming growth of heresies,such as Ebionitism and Gnosticism, that pertinently revealed the need of more definite standards, yet at the beginning of the third century systematic theology was still in a merely formative state.

Heretical activities also moved the church in the direction of a definite Canon of Scripture. Gnostic freedom in the treatment of the Old Testament,tended to emphasise for orthodox Christiams the Jewish estimate of that volume,while Marcion's formation of his own N.T.Canon stimulated the church to an increasing discrimination and decision in the choice of the various writings with apparent claims to canonicity.Generally speaking, apostolicity came to be considered as the basis for such canonicity,yet much time was needed,or at least taken,for the crystallization of the general judgement. This is seen in the fact that when Eusebius wrote on this matter in the year 325 A.D.,he assigns seven of the books,now in the N.T.Canon,to the class of Antilegomena,while other books,later decided to be non-canonical, during the first few centuries,were given a consideration which practically aligned them with the teachings of undisputed authority(a).

The time had therefore arrived for a more systematic presentation of Christianity's beliefs in a positive form,and it is in the Alexandrian School that we shall find this need

most clearly appreciated.and the most sustained and daring efforts put forth to supply it.Both Clement and Origen recognised that more was needed than a demonstration of the falsity of heathen and heretical religious systems,necessary as that might be;the strongest refutation of error is the clear presentation of what is right.To Clement therefore his task was obvious and mandatory; what was needed was a larger and bolder discussion of the various elements already existing in the church tradition and brief statements of faith,as well as an attempt to explore and clarify the large field of thought that lay outside the simple confessions then in existence.

It was not the specialty of Clement to systematise so much as it was to provide the material for others.And for such preparatory work he was peculiarly well equipped."Biblical and philosophical learning unites in him with genius and speculative power.He claims all learning for the service of Christianity and in that service uses it abundantly"(a).Even as Philo had sought to exhibit a true harmony between Judaism and Greek philosophy so Clement is full of the thought "that the mission of the Christian theologian is to build a bridge between the Gospel and Gentile wisdom,to point out the relations of Christianity to universal knowledge,to give to the religion of Christ a scientific form,to show how the believer may rise to the position of the true "Gnostic""(b).

It has been already noted that Clement rates human culture as a stage in the Divine education of the soul,but this does not mean that he undervalued the Scriptures.While there is no schism in the manifestation of the Divine Reason seeing all truth is from God,yethe recognises Scripture as pre-eminently

God's Word.At the same time he finds the evidence of the inspiration of Scripture within the human reason,not in any external authority.Inspiration for him is not an arbitrary or coercive action of the Divine Spirit upon the human,as it was for the Montanists;it is rather the highest exercise of that capacity for discerning truth with which the soul is endowed in virtue of its Divine sonship. Revelation and inspiration were at their height among the Apostles,because the Apostles both lived in close communion with the Incarnate Word,and because the Word was then in the fulness of time more perfectly revealing Himself(a).

With this general view towards the subject of Scripture Clement does not exhibit any great keenness of critical insight. He accepts not only the entire Septuagint but also many apocryphal works,Jewish and Christian,in addition.Similar freedom with the New Testament is equally evident.He seems to have "recognized as Canonical all the books of the New Testament except the Epistle of St James,the second Epistle of Peter,and the third Epistle of John,and his silence as to these can prove no more than that he was not acquainted with them"(b).On the other hand his use of the Epistle of Barnabas and Revelation of Peter might indicate his acceptance of these as canonical also.

In his interpretation of Scripture Clement condemned the literalism of the Rabbins,and,in conformity with the Platonic maxim "Nothing is to be believed which is unworthy of God",freely allegorized,especially in all passages which define God in purely anthroporphic terms.But the comparative values of Scripture and philosophy can best be gauged by his own words:"The teaching which is according to the Saviour is complete in itself and without defect,being "the power and wisdom of God";and the Hellenic

philosophy does not by its approach make the truth more powerful,but rendering powerless the assault of sophistry against it, and frustrating the treacherous plots laid against the truth,is said to be the proper "fence and wall of the vineyard". And the truth which is according to faith is as necessary for life as bread;while the preparatory discipline is like sauce and sweetmeats"(a).Yet as to the origin of this "philosophy"it is worth noting that Clement seems undecided,sometimes repeating the old delusion that the Greek philosopher had "stolen"his best ideas from Moses,at other times he maintains that it is the gift of God through the L gos (b).Which simply illustrates the fluidity in theological opinions from which Clement must draw his conclusions.

No man is entirely independent of the age he lives in; traditional or so-called authoritative beliefs demand and receive a certain homage,and while Clement found a great field of undefined or nebulous theories to work with,it must not be forgotten that from the past he inherited much that,as a basis of his studies,was bound to lead him into obvious contradictions. The comparative values of the Old and New Testaments,as developed by Paul and the writer of Hebrews,had,so far,largely escaped attention from the Apologists of the second century,hence the Old Testament was given such high rating in divine inspiration as to make the use of Allegory in its interpretation not merely a useful but a necessary aid.And as Allegory is but another name for Imagination here was opened a fascinatingly inviting field for all speculative minds,so attractive that as we shall see in the case of Origen the method was extended to the study of the New Testament as well.And these are but samples of inherited

tendencies or theological inhibitions for which neither Clement nor Origen was responsible but by which they felt constrained to model their principal conclusions.

To understand then both the urgency and the difficulty of the task of initiating a definite scientific theology it is absolutely necessary to recall the conditions of the age in which Clement carried on his work.Taking advantage of the lack of systematised Christian teaching the Gnostics,dominated by philosophic ideals,had seriously misrepresented both Christianity and the best philosophic ideals,by their varied dualistic systems, thus assuming the scholastic leadership of the church. By so doing they had brought heathen learning into evil odor with a large part of the Christian membership,learned as well as unlearned.Their action constituted a double challenge:to construct a positive Christian doctrinal system,and to so re-align the elements of that system as to maintain the supremacy of Holy Scripture with Greek philosophy as its ministering subordinate.

That this could be done was shown by Philo's work in his Hellenisation of Judaism;that it was both dangerous and difficult,perhaps impossible,to unite harmoniously Greek abstractions with Semitic concretism,was also evident from the obvious contradictions in Philonism.But the challenge of his day and his own philosophic predilections decided Clement to dare the dangers and test the possibilities of the Philonic policy as applied to Christianity and its problems.Here then will be found the demonstration of a continuity of religious thought which unites the Jewish and Christian Alexandrian Schools of theology,and which resulted in that spiritual,speculative,and scientific type of religious thinking as

distinguished from the more literalistic and legalistic ideals of Carthage and Rome.

The literary activities of Clement form a collection of writings which are "among the most valuable remains of Christian antiquity, and the largest that belong to that early period" (a). This literary industry of the master may well have been an inspiration to the still more industrious pupil, Origen, as he toiled at his gigantic tasks, and the lack of system in Clement's productions doubtless operated to bring about that better organization of religious beliefs which has given Origen the honour of being the Church's first systematic theologian.

His three great works are (I) "The Exhortation to the Heathen", generally known as the "Protrepticus". This contains a withering exposure of the licentiousness, the imposture, and sordidness of paganism (a). (2) The Instructor or "Paedagogus", which is addressed to Christian converts. It consists of three books. In the first book Clement dwells upon the sufficiency of Christ as the Instructor, emphasising His wisdom, faithfulness, and righteousness. The second and third books form a detailed guide in all the minutiae of a Christian's life, and in its very detail gives an emphasis to the moral dangers of the age in which it was written. (3) The full title of the "Stromata" or "Stromateis" is "Titus Flavius Clement's miscellaneous collections of speculative (gnostic) notes bearing upon the true philosophy" It is intended for those who have benefited by the instruction in the Paedagogus and thus fitted for the Christian Gnosis and have the desire to attain the noble rank of Christian Gnostics. The central thought is Christ, the Logos, the Supreme and perfect Gnostic, in whom all truth is unified, seeing that He is the original source (b).

"The Stromata are written carelessly,and even confusedly;but the work is one of prodigious learning,and it was regarded as the author's great work"(a).His three principal works were probably written in the order given,and all of them before Clement's retirement from Alexandria in 202 A.D.

"The three compositions are really parts of one whole. The central connecting idea is that of the Logos-the Word-the Son of God;whom in the first work he exhibits as drawing men from heathenism to faith;in the second,as training them by precepts and discipline;and in the last,as conducting them into the higher realm of the true Gnosis,the final ideal of all who are earnestly ambitious to excel in the spiritual life"(b). However,in addition to these noble ideals one finds in these books plenty of false science,and frivolous and fanciful speculation.

In designating the noblest form of Christian life as that of the Christian "Gnostic" Clement shows,not only a courageous disregard of the violent prejudice against that title, but also a rare judgement.He saw clearly that it was a wiser and more aggressive policy "to spoil the Egyptians" than merely to denounce their pretensions.To the learned world of his day he exhibits the Christian faith,not as an antagonist,but as the true sphere of all knowledge,and Jesus,the Logos-Reason, as the real fountain head of Gnosis,and Christian Gnosticism therefore as the nearest approach to God.

From his intimate discussion of the Eleusinian Mysteries in the second chapter of the Protrepticus it has been assumed that Clement had himself passed through the various stages of its Katharsis,Muesis,and Epopteia,and further that

the development of Christian instruction in his three main productions is but a transfer of Eleusinian standards into Christian education. Be that as it may,it is evident that Clement realized the too obvious inequality among Christians in the desire for spiritual excellence,and not being obsessed by the modern mania for "Standardization",he arranged his courses of study in accord with the mental content as he found it.

Quis Dives Salvetur,a practical treatise on the proper estimate of wealth,and possibly an expansion of the briefer discussion of the same subject in chapter 5,book 2,of the Stromateis, is another of Clement's surviving works.Of other numerous works only a few fragments have been preserved.Chief among these are The Hypotyposes,The Adumbrations,and The Selections from the Prophetic Scriptures,all of which seem to have been expository discussions of Scripture. Many other writings have been lost; their titles are interestingly suggestive of his wide range of thought,but such a list would have no particular value in this discussion.

The Protrepticus,Paedagogus,and the Stromateis are the generally accepted basis for the study of Clement's contributions to Christian thought,but before taking up the task of culling from these (by the help of more learned students) the outstanding religious principles with which Clement's name has become closely identified,it may be wise to state briefly here one or two of the basal distinctions which differentiate Clement's theology from the western Augustinianism.

Clement being possessed of the genuine sunny Greek view of life takes the optimistic stand in regard to man's religious outlook.God is Good,God is Love,and through the Logos

all men have a relationship with God;Augustine,from personal experience and heretical associations,magnifies the power of evil in man. The solidarity of mankind in Adam may be called the main principle in Augustinianism whereas Clement finds that solidarity in Christ,the perfect Man. The Alexandrian Father holds that nothing reflecting upon the goodness of God should be believed,but the bishop of Hippo is more zealous for a doctrinal system and the power of the earthly church than for the Divine character.Clement opposes the fatalism of the Gnostic by his emphasis upon human Free-Will;Augustine practically re-introduces this paralysing doctrine,and in addition makes God the direct source of evil. Augustine was a High Churchman;the two great Alexandrines were not.

Nor shall we find either Clement or Origen making final claims for their conclusions.They were first of all seekers after truth;to others they granted the same right.Judged by later standards there are obvious defects in the Alexandrine theology, but this is equally true of that later credal teaching with its preposterous claims as the ultimate statement.Against such demands both Clement and Origen would doubtless have protested, for while they possessed a larger erudition than most men this but reminded them of human limitations.This is the wisdom born of humility,the possession of which gave Socrates a rightful claim to be the wisest man of his age;but a wisdom conspicuous by its absence in much church history with its dogmatic fulminations and arrogant assumptions.

Thus the Alexandrian type of theology possesses distinctive features of its own,and in these it contributes much of supreme value,and it is to these values our study is now directed.

Clement's Theology.

God. The knowledge of God is necessarily the starting point of the religious philosopher. Clement is an eclectic in philosophy and his concept of God is a rare blend of Philonism, Platonism, and Aristotelianism. This last element, the doctrine of the Absolute, he may have drawn through Basilides or Valentinus(a). While Philo claimed that "we may know that He is, but not what He is" Clement asserts that we know "only what He is not". God "is not a subject for demonstration" (b), "what is Divine is unutterable by human power" (c). Yet He is Good (d). But names, as denoting qualities or relations, are inapplicable to Him: "He is formless and nameless, though we sometimes give Him titles, which are not to be taken in their proper sense, the One, the Good, ---- Father, Creator, or Lord. These are but honorable phrases, which we use, not because they really describe the Eternal, but that our understanding may have something to lean upon" (e). After this metaphysical effort to define the undefinable, an effort characterised by Bigg as "this appalling definition", it is easy to see why the doctrine of the Logos becomes the central idea of Clement's theology, for by means of the Logos alone can God be restored to that actuality of which He has been deprived.

The Logos. "The Logos is the Revealer, first in the Creation, in which the Logos takes part, by whom wisdom is stamped upon it; again, in the light of reason imparted to mankind; then in special disclosures of divine truth, and, finally, through the Incarnation in Christ" (f). Thus while Clement by the above definition presents God as the Everlasting No, in the Logos he exhibits the Everlasting Yea. But this raises the question that if Father and Son are equally Divine how is it possible for the one to

possess qualities and relations which the nature of the other positively forbids?In while one finds himself confronted by the same question,though in a lesser degree,nor does Plotinus satisfactorily answer it.

"The Logos is conceived of,after the manner of the Stoics, as the seminal reason diffused in all beings to whom reason is given"(a).This agrees with the Logos definition by Justin Martyr in which he says that"human reason is a mere sperma of the primal Logos,but in Christ the All of reason abode in full perfection" (b). The distinction of Father and Son is affirmed(c)"Yet in some passages the personal distinction seems to fade out"(d). But the prevailing view is that of the Son as a distinct Hypostasis(e).

There was no doubt in Clement's mind as to the timeless Personality of the Logos;he rejects the distinction between the Spoken and Unspoken Word(f).The idea of the Son's subordination is strictly secondary in Clement.Always he recurs to the essential Unity of the Father and Son,and has no scruple about prayer to the latter (g) Whether or not Clement holds to the true humanity of Christ is an open question.Fisher's statement is that "there is no ambiguity in the assertion of the true divinity and the true humanity of Christ"(h),but Bigg considers that Clement's Platonism has here "led perilously near to the confines of Docetism(i).

Christ is our ransom(j),He is our propitiation(k), but these are definitions of Christ's work upon which Clement does not dwell.In connection with the suffering of Christ it is worthy of note that Clement speaks of the Passion of Jesus as undesigned by God(l),a view which is also found in his conception

of human Redemption. The only sacrificial title, which he distinctly applies to our Lord, is that of the Lamb of God (a). Many of the phrases which he applies to the Son-the Name, the Face, the House of God, and so on-are borrowed from Philo (b). The forgiveness of sin in Clement's mind signifies not merely the cancelling of a penalty, but the cure of that ignorance which is the cause and strength of sin (c)."Forgiveness was undoubtedly a most difficult idea to the Alexandrines, who firmly believed in the changelessness of God, and that the Christian should be taught to look, not upon the Crucified, but upon the Risen Lord, the fountain not of pardon, but of life"(d).

Clement shares with the writers of the sub-apostolic age in a lack of emphasis upon the Sacrificial Atonement of Christ, but "the spirit of Hellenism lies heavier on Clement than on others"(e); to him Christ was pre-eminently the Teacher and Guide, and while he speaks of Jesus as our High Priest he does so only in the Philonic sense, as our Representative and Intercessor (f). His prevailing concept of Christ is probably well expressed in one of his own statements:"The Word of God became Man, in order that thou mayest learn from Man how man becomes God"(g).

The Holy Spirit. Clement had evidently proposed to enter at length upon this subject, in a separate treatise, but never accomplished the task (h). He is none too clear as to the relat- between the Father and Son; he is still less so as the relation of the Third Person to the First and Second. Is this increasing haziness due to the fact that in the matter of a Trinity Philo's speculations afford no help? If so it was not confined to Clement; Hippolytus, in the concluding sketch of vital Christian

doctrine,in the Philosophumena,omits all mention of the Holy Spirit.As to the Personality of the Holy Spirit Clement seems to have no doubt(a)."The Father,Son,and Holy Spirit are the "Holy Triad"(b).The Holy Spirit,equally with the Logos,speaks by the prophets (c).It is He who binds together the Church, Visible and Invisible (d).It is He whose "dew" washes away our sins,and sanctifies both body and soul (e).And Clement would have us understand that He is present in no pantheistic sense; He is in us,not in essence,but in power (f)

Creation and Man.

Matter is not eternal(g);this world was given shape and substance by the Word in accordance with the Divine model,the world of Ideas (h).The six days of Creation Clement interprets allegorically (i).Man is pre-eminent because of special creation (j),and by virtue of the Divine endowment of the "Spirit",or "Intellect",the Sovereign Faculty"of the tripartite soul(k). This "image'or"Reason" is the"love-charm" which makes man dear to God for his own sake (l).

To the Platonists and Gnostics Matter was evil,and man sinful because of entanglement therein. The Christian view makes God the Creator of All,hence all is good.To Clement then the problem was how to account for evil in Man,and his answer was the Freedom of The Human Will! Here he parts company with both St Paul and Plato,and so "Clement is the first of Christian writers to assert clearly the doctrine of freewill"(m)."It is to be found in the Apologists,but the Alexandrines were the first to define it and make it the foundation of a system (n).

In opposition to the reasoning of the Gnostics the Alexandrines made Will an independent faculty,and thus man is

himself is responsible for the evil or good he chooses." Though Clement did not like Origen attack the problem of cosmical evil, yet this contribution of his to theology is of the utmost value, and itself would entitle him to a master's place"(a). Gnostic Determinism or Predestination, in the Alexandrine view, appeared to impugn both the divine goodness and the divine right to punish sin, and it was not until Gnosticism had been vanquished that Christian theology began to divide humanity into elect and non-elect. It was a very real enemy the Alexandrines had to contend with, so, "in their recoil from Gnosticism they abolished Necessity altogether, and gave freedom a new meaning"(b).

Adam, then, was created with the possibilities of perfection, but possibilities which must be actualised into virtue by obedience. He fell by lust, and so we all fall (c). Clement does not admit any hereditary guilt; God punishes only voluntary sins(d). The sins forgiven in Baptism are always spoken of as actual sins, for of Infant Baptism Clement makes no mention(e). So men may choose to believe or disbelieve(f), the only obstacle to the salvation of men is in themselves. But while the freedom of choice remains, the soul depends on the Holy Spirit for its renewal(g). The Christian life begins in faith, that is belief in the desirability of the End, and willing submission to the Means in their regular progression(h). Yet faith is but the minimum condition of admittance into the Kingdom of Heaven; it is not full spiritual life(i). The gate of the Church is the Baptism of Regeneration, wherein we receive free forgiveness for all past sins, and thus started fairly in the race for the eternal crown by the way of knowledge, in light and love(j).

Redemption, then, is not so much the undoing of the past, as the

lifting of man up to a higher state than pertained to unfallen man;"redemption turns wholly on the soul being flooded with light,combined with the lessons of experience"(a).

To Clement the Christian life,as he saw it practiced in his day,assumed a Negative and Positive aspect,a Lower and Higher. The Negative or Lower was that of the great body of Christians, and its marks are Faith,Fear,and Hope(b).Its crown is Holiness, (c),the negative virtue of Self-Control.Simply to be saved is something very different from salvation in the nobler sense(d). This was the type of Christian he saw in First Corinthians,3-I, and in Hebrews,5-I3.But this persistence in and contentment with the lower,joyless,Christian life was,after all,their choice,their own freewill in exercise. All who reach the higher life must pass through the Lower,and all are invited to "come up higher", to "philosophize",to strive upward to the highest ideal(e). All are challenged to exchange "pistis" for "gnosis".

Clement delights to speak of the Higher Life in terms borrowed from Eleusis."It is the Greater Mysteries,of which Christ is the Hierophant and Torchbearer(f).In the Higher Life Faith gives way to Knowledge,Fear and Hope to Love,while Holiness is merged in Righteousness.This progress in Knowledge is a growing knowledge of Christ,for all "gnosis is in Him(g).The Gnostic is "the pure in heart"who "sees God".The Light of this new revelation reveals to him the deep things of Scripture.In other words he becomes a master in the Christian Mysteries,an Allegorist.

Of Knowledge Love is at once the life-element and the instrument(h).But Clement substitutes the Stoic Apathy for Christian, natural love!Christ,like God,was absolutely passionless,so were the Apostles after the Resurrection,so must the true Gnostic be.

Self-Control, Holiness, has made the reason absolute master of the brute in the centaur man. He will feel those desires which, like hunger or thirst, are necessary for self-preservation, but not joy, nor sorrow, nor courage, nor indignation, nor hatred." He lives in the closest union with the Beloved, so absorbed in the Divine Love that he can no longer be said to love his fellow-creatures in the ordinary sense of the word" (a).

But in his mysticism Clement is rigidly practical, so much so that he can hardly be ranked with the mystical school. The life of his Christian Gnostic is no dream existence apart from active, outward achievment. "Good works follow Gnosis as shadow follows substance" (b). Contemplation is the Gnostic's chief delight, the next is active beneficence, the third is instruction, the work of making others like himself-the salvation of other men (c). Nor is he above the necessity of using the regular church ordinances (d), while in Prayer, public and private alike, he develops that genuine fellowship with God wherein he finds the true joy of existence (e)

But let it be observed that this ideal life is based upon Reason and Knowledge, the fruitage of man's highest faculties in their active co-operation with the Grace of the Logos. "The instrument to which he looks for growth in knowledge is not trance, but the disciplined reason" (f). This consummation of Christian Gnosticism is neither Philonic nor Neo-Platonic Ecstacy; it is a continuous condition not an occasional rapture. And Clement's religious ideal as thus expressed, in its emphasis upon man's reason, the most divine-like human quality, is in that emphasis just the more in accord with man's highest possibilities than either the Philonic or Neo-Platonic ecstatic objective.

To Clement it must have seemed illogical and impossible to imagine that the Vision of The Highest and Best could be either obtained or enjoyed by a human soul without the aid of his own highest and best faculty, Reason. Ecstacy formed no part in the Gnostic mysticism of Clement.

Clement's Christian Gnostic, then, is the Christian at his best, through manifold effort, devotion, and Love. It was largely a mere ideal consummation, but the process of growth through knowledge was too strenuous, too single-eyed for the multitude. For these the lower life suffices; they reserve to themselves the right to live in the marshlands; the heights beyond repel rather than attract. Only the nobler, more adventurous spirits elect themselves as candidates and contestants for the prizes in the Higher School of Christian Truth.

For this division of Christian life into Two Ways Clement has been criticised. Bigg holds that "in his desire to win back the sectaries he draped Christiamity in a Gnostic garb" (a). But the fatalism of heathen Gnosticism which divided humanity into three classes, pneumatic, psychic, and hylic, closed the door to human choice (b), whereas Clement's classification of Christians assumes free-will as the very basis of the arrangement. Therefore he assumes that those who prefer the lower life must be fed with such spiritual food as befits "children of fear" (c). The mysteries of higher education are not for those who refuse to go beyond the Grammar School stage, so those babes in Christ who refuse to grow, are not fit to receive the mysteries of the Kingdom. Thus the Doctrine of Reserve is after all only an accommodation of Christian standards to the Will and Choice of the different types of Christians. And Clement had the courage to call

attention to the reservationists of his day,and to emphasise the obvious distinction between such and those others who,by every legitimate means,sought to "grow in the grace and knowledge of Jesus Christ".

Nor does it seem justifiable for Harnack to say that Clement's Stromata "was the means of first restricting Christianity to thinking men"(a).The Christians of the Lower Way are not unchurched by Clement;the Christian Gnostic excels because through knowledge he has exchanged Love for Fear(b).And so he rightly stands at the head of his class.

The Church. "Clement does not give any formal definition of the church.There are no traces in his writings of the doctrine of apostolical succession;the unity of the church is nowhere made to depend upon unity with the bishop.The clergy are not regarded as having any special priestly character;everywhere the Scriptures are placed above the church as well as before it,and Scripture is not intrusted to the hierarchy for preservation or interpretation,but to the Christian conscience"(b).Clement's interest lay far more with that Invisible Kingdom within the redeemed soul than in the Visible,Earthly organization.

According to Clement the Church is the "company of the Elect",the Pride of Christ.She is One,Catholic,as the doctrine and tradition of the Apostles are one(c).Peter is the first of the Apostles(d),but of his Roman bishopric there is no mention. In the One church,however,there is a distinction.There are those who live as Gentiles,these are the flesh of Christ's mystical body;there are those who cleave to the Lord and become one with Him;these are the Holy,the Spiritual,Church(e). The claim of the Christian ministry to be the lineal successor of the priestly

Jew Clement rejects.To him the true antitype of the Levite is the Gnostic who has the spiritual unction of the Holy Spirit(a). The Christian Gnostic,though he does not sit in the chair of authority,is the genuine Presbyter(b);the noblest praise is of sacrificial quality,prayer is incense,the altar is the just soul, or the congregation of believers(c).The only higher sacrifice is that on Calvary(d).He rarely mentions the three orders of Clergy, and nowhere in connection with the Sacraments(e).

Clement's estimate of the Eucharist has been interpreted very differently by different writers.Some think he teaches Transubstantiation,while others find only a Zuinglian judgement.Which merely proves that he did not consider it sufficiently important to define exactly(f).However,his whole attitude in regard to the Christian Faith,his designation of the Elements as an Allegory(g), and the significant fact that he does not hesitate to call the family meals in the Christian homes "an Eucharist" all suggest very strongly that Clement was untouched by any High Church concept of the Lord's Supper(h).

Clement's idea of God and His relationship to this world led him to strongly oppose the ascetic tendencies of his age.The world is sacred as a divine creation,so,while we are sojourners in the world,we are also at home in the world(i).Family life is superior to celibacy,and Clement applied Christ's words "there am I in the midst of them"to the home gathering of parents and children(j).

In the brief glimpses we have of Clement's eschatological teachings the same sanctified common sense controls.The popular Chiliasm has no place in his scheme of the future(k).As to the Resurrection body of believers he accepted Paul's

"glorified" body, purified by fire(a), as against the theory sustained by Tertullian "that the identical flesh of the body laid in the grave would be re-animated(b). The future life of the redeemed is not static but progressive, they will still be objects of the Redeemer's purifying power(c).

There is thus a purgatorial element evident in Clement's view of the future world. Even the just must be purged by the "wise fire" in order to enter the presence of God(d); angels take "toll" of those passing upward(e), each to his own place of merited reward and future service(f). In Clement's vision of that world of perfect awards the true Christian Gnostic naturally receives the fullest recognition(g), to him is given that rest of God "who ceases not from doing good"(i).

As to the fate of those who have, in this life, resisted and recoiled from the Logos Light is not so clear in Clement. "Probably he, like Origen, looks for a final victory over evil, however long continued the process of discipline might have to be, by which that victory should be attained"(j). His theory of punishment presents the thought of correction rather than retribution(k), so he seems to extend the probation time of all sinners until the final Judgement Day(l).

Such, in brief, are the teachings of this pioneer in the realm of Scientific Religion. Written not as a complete system of Christian teaching, and unsystematic within its own limits, his work was done under the high pressure of immediate needs rather than with an eye to the distant future. Without any definite charts he directed his theological course between those two equally dangerous tendencies, ignorant Orthodoxy and arrogant Gnosticism, and by escaping both Clement has given good proof of a well-bal-

mind. With Philo he endeavoured to be equally loyal to Revelation and Philosophy, judging both to be of God; the resultant combination reveals similar defects. However, while it may be true that "the need and the fact of the Atonement and the Christian doctrine of grace are foreign to the scheme" (a), it is equally true that the Logos-Redeemer represents the very core of Clement's plan of salvation, and no one has emphasised more strongly the need of practical righteousness as the fruit of theological beliefs.

In an age of increasing theological gloom Clement's was an optimistic religion. His God was Infinite Goodness whose Justice and Mercy were one; the Logos, as the world creator, was also its unfailing source of Light, Life, and Love, and the Incarnation was the final proof of His interest in the salvation of humanity. And this salvation was free to all alike; there was no Divine barrier in the way, nor any inherited guilt from Adam. Every man is able to choose right or wrong. Thus the Divine Goodness and the Freedom of the Human Will are Clement's central truths; his theology is adjusted accordingly.

In the development of the Alexandrian Christian theology Clement and Origen are co-workers; one sows, the other reaps. Nor does the official judgement of the Church separate them for Clement too failed to receive saintship; Popes Clement and Benedict evidently had a higher estimate of Photius, the politician-patriarch, in his aspersions of Clement , than of the spirituality of the Alexandrian Pioneer. But, after all, neither Clement nor Origen had any sympathy with later High Church developments; their homage was not for any earthly authority but for God Alone.

Notes and References on Chapter 3

Page I.

(a) Bigg, "The Christian Platonists of Alexandria" p.36.
(b) Eusebius, H.E. 3.I6; Jerome, "Vir illus". 2.8.

Page 2.

(a) Col.2-I6, I John 4-2.
(b) Fisher, "History of The Christian Church", p.75.
(c) Foakes-Jackson, "History of The Christian Church", p.I96.

Page 3.

(a) Cruttwell, "A Literary History of Christianity", vol.2, p. 430.
(b) Fairweather, "Origen", p.3.
(c) Ibid.
(d) Bigg, "The Christian Platonists of Alexandria", p.50.
(e) Origen, "Contra Celsum", 3.44-78.

Page 4.

(a) Hatch, "The Hibbert Lectures" of I888, p.I38.
(b) Bigg, "The Christian Platonists of Alexandria", pp.39-40.

Page 5.

(a) Cruttwell, "A Literary History of Early Christianity", vol.2, p.435.
(b) Stephenson, "The History of Christianity", vol.I, p.3I7.
(c) Fairweather, "Origen", p.I2.
(d) Epiphanius, 32.6.
(e) Clement of Alex. "Strom". I.I.
(f) Ibid. Paed. I.6.37.

Page 6.

(a) Cruttwell, "A Lit.Hist.of Early Christianity", vol.2, p. 440.
(b) Bigg, "The Christian Platonists of Alexandria", pp.45-46.
(c) Clement, "Strom". I.5.28; 6.5.42, &6.8.67.
(d) Tertullian, "Praescript", 8-II.

Page 7.

(a) Fairweather, "Origen", p.4.
(b) Gwatkin, "Early Church History", vol.2, p.I57.

Page 8.

(a) Foakes-Jackson, "History of The Christian Church", p.I48.
(b) Ibid. p.I47 (footnote).
(c) Tertullian, "De praescript.heret". c.7.
(d) Rainy, "The Ancient Catholic Church", p.I62.
(e) Clement, "Strom". 6.I7.I49.

Page 9.

(a) Fisher, "History of The Christian Church", p.79.

Page I0.

(a) Schaff, "History of The Christian Church", vol.2.
(b) Fisher, "History of Christian Doctrine", p.94.

Page II.

(a) Cruttwell,"A Lit.Hist.of Early Christianity",vol.2, pp.451-452.
(b) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.52.

Page I2.

(a) Clement,"Strom". I.20.
(b) Ibid. Compare "Strom".5.14.87. Also "Protrep".6.68.

Page I4.

(a) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.2.p.I67.
(b) Ibid. p.I68.

Page I5.

(a) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.2,p.I68.
(b) Ibid.pp.I68-I69.

Page I8.

(a) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.64(note).
(b) Clement,Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.2,p.438.
(c) Ibid, p.463.
(d) Ibid, pp.225ff.
(e) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.63.
(f) Fisher,"History of Christian Doctrine",p.95.

Page I9.

(a) Fisher,"History of Christian Doctrine",p.95.
(b) Foakes-Jackson,"History of The Christian Church",p. I60.
(c) Clement,"Strom". 4.25.
(d) Fisher,"History of Christian Doctrine",p.95.
(e) Clement,"Paed". I.6.42. "Strom",6.7.58.
(f) Bigg,"The Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.68.
(g) Clement,"Paed". 3.I2.I0I.
(h) Fisher,"History of Christian Doctrine",p.95.
& Clement,"Prot".I.
(i) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.72.
(j) Clement,"Quis Div.Salv". 37.
(k) Clement,"Paed". 3.I2.
(l) Clement,"Strom", 4.I2.86.

Page 20.

(a) Clement,"Paed". I.5.24.
(b) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.67(note).
(c) Clement,"Paed". I.3.7.
(d) Clement,"Strom". 2.I4.58.
(e) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.73.
(f) Clement,"Protrep", I2.I20.
(g) Ibid. I.8.
(h) Clement,"Strom". 5.I3.38.

Page 21.

(a) Clement, "Paed". I.6.42;3.I2.I0I.
(b) Clement, "Strom". 5.I4.
(c) Clement, "Protrep". I.8;8.79.
(d) Clement, "Strom". 7.2.9.
(e) Clement, "Quis Div.Salv". 34;" Strom".4.26.
(f) Clement, "Strom".7.I4.87
(g) Clement, "Strom".5.I4.89.
(h) Clement, "Strom". 5.6.39;I4.93.
(i) Clement, "Strom".6.I6.I42.
(j) Clement, "Paed". I.3.7.
(k) Clement, "Strom".3.I0.68;2.II;6.I6.I34.
(l) Clement, "Paed".I.3.7.
(m) Cruttwell, "History of Early Christian Lit".p.449.
(n) Bigg, "Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.78.

Page 22.

(a) Cruttwell, "Lit.Hist.of Early Christianity",p.449.
(b) Bigg, "Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.80.
(c) Clement, "Strom".,2.I4.60.
(d) Clement, "Protrept". II.III.
(e) Bigg, "Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.8I.
(f) Clement, "Strom". 3.9.65;7.3.I3.
(g) Clement, "Strom". 2.I9;4.26.
(h) Ibid. 2.2.3.4.
(i) Clement, "Paed". I.I.3.
(j) Ibid.I.6.

Page 23.

(a) Rainy, "The Ancient Catholic Church",p.I67.
(b) Clement, "Strom". 2.I2.55.
(c) Ibid, 4.22.I35.
(d) Ibid,6.I4.
(e) Clement, "Paed". I.4;6.33:"Strom".I9.II8-I24.
(f) Bigg, "Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.9I.
(g) Clement, "Strom",4.25.I55;6.I.2.
(h) Clement, "Quis Div.Salv". 27.

Page 24.

(a) Bigg, "Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.94.
Clement, "Strom". 4 & 6.
(b) Clement, "Strom". 7.I3.82.
(c) Ibid. 4.22.I36.
(d) Clement, "Paed". 2.I0.96;" Strom".7.I2.76; Q.D.S.33.
(e) Clement, "Strom". 4.23.I48.
(f) Bigg, "Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.98.

Page 25.

(a) Bigg, "Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.84.
(b) Rainy, "The Ancient Catholic Church",p.I00.
(c) The Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.2,pp.2I6-2I7.

Page 26.

(a) Harnack,"History of Dogma",p.150.
(b) Allen,"The Continuity of Christian Thought",pp.61-62.
(c) Clement,"Strom".4.26;7.5.29;3.6.49;II.74;7.17.107.
"Paed". I.6.42.
(d) Clement,"Quis Div.Salv". 21.
(e) Clement,""Strom". 7.II.68.cf 7.14.87.

Page 27.

(a) Clement,"Strom".4.25;7.7.36.
(b) Ibid. 6.13.106.
(c) Ibid,"Paed".3.12.90;"Strom".5.14.67;&6.31.32.
(d) Ibid,5.II.66.70.
(e) Ibid,"Strom". 6.13.107.
(f) Ibid,"Strom".4.26.161;"Paed".I.6.43.
(g)Ibid,"Paed". 2.2.32.
(h) Allen,"The Continuity of Christian Thought",p.63.
(i) Clement,"Strom".4.25.
(j) Clement,"Paed".2.I.10.

Page 28.

(a) Clement,"Paed". I.4.10; 6.46.
(b) Allen,"The Continuity of Christian Thought",p.67.
(c) Clement,"Strom". 6.6.
(d) Ibid, 7.6.34.
(e) Ibid, 4.18.117.
(f) Ibid, 4.18.114; 6.14.108.
(g) Ibid, 4.25.158; 7.10.56.
(i) Ibid, 6.12.104.
(j) Rainy,"The Ancient Catholic Church",pp.164-165.
(k) Clement,"Strom". I.26.168;4.24.154;6.12.99.
(l) Ibid, 7.2.12.

Page 29.

(a) Rainy,"The Ancient Catholic Church",p.167.

The Christian School of Alexandria.

Chapter 4.

Origen- Spiritual Non-Conformist.

The Christian School of Alexandria.

Chapter 4.

Origen-Spiritual Non-Conformist.

Origen is the most distinguished and influential of all the theologians of the early Church with the exception of Augustine. His father was the martyr,Leonidas,and the date of his birth is usually given as I85 or I86 A.D.(a). Alexandria,for centuries the home of the various schools of philosophy,was the appropriate birth-place of this genius,who,with such unique skill,demonstrated the possibilities of a religious and intellectual syncretism.

Whether or not Origen was a native Egyptian or Copt(b) is an open question.Biggs holds that such was his nationality(c), but when its is recalled that Porphyry,who would not be likely to miss such a chance of disparaging a great leader in Christian thought,calls him "a Greek"(d),and that his father's name is certainly Hellenic,there does not seem sufficient reason to deny him an ancestry in harmony with his devotion to Greek thought.

Unlike his great teacher,Clement,Origen was a child of the church,and reared in a noble type of Christian home life. Trained thoroughly in the Holy Scriptures by his father,Origen,as a boy, began to exhibit the spirit of Biblical investigation which became so marked a trait in his maturer years. Nor did the usual course of public instruction in grammar,mathematics,logic,rhetoric,with their necessary introduction to Greek literature,in any way detract from Origen's enthusiastic study of Christian truth.

In those testing days of fiery persecution under the Emperor Severus(202-203 A.D.),when his father fell a victim to heathen hate,and his family reduced to poverty,Origen,as a mere lad of only seventeen or eighteen years,was one of the most an-

compromising confessors of the faith,and was only saved from his father's fate by the friendly restraint of older Christians. For a short time he remained the guest of a wealthy Christian lady of Alexandria,but the association therein with her adopted son,Paul of Antioch,a leading member of the Gnostic Alexandrians, proved too irksome for the son of Leonidas and the pupil of Clement.Even at that early stage in his life Origen saw the un-Christian aspect of Gnosticism,and the presence of a leader in this false presentation of Christianity,made it impossible for the lad to enjoy the hospitality of a home where such a man was highly honoured(a).

He therefore resolved to enter upon the career of a teacher of grammar,and so support himself by his own exertions. Young as he was,his unusual literary ability and personal magnetism speedily attracted attention and brought him many pupils. But his instruction in Greek literature provided so many opportunities for comparisons between heathenism and his own faith, opportunities which Origen seems to have fully employed,that very soon he had a class of those who sought mainly instruction in the Christian way.That his youthful tact and zeal were equal to this demand is seen in the production of such men as Plutarch, afterwards a martyr,and Heraclas,who later became bishop of Alexandria(b)

This phenomenal success as a teacher,and his intrepid fearlessness in showing sympathy for those suffering on behelf of Christ,won for Origen a front-rank place in the Egyptian church,and when a new teacher for the famous Catechetical School, temporarily in abeyance on account of the persecution and the retirement of Clement,was sought,it was only in recognition of

the unique merit of this stripling that he was given charge of so important an enterprise.In that time of danger there may have been but small choice in the matter;to become the accepted teacher of a proscribed sect required considerable courage in addition to educational qualities,and as Bishop Demetrius was notable for his lack of learning while Origen had exhibited both requisites in a marked degree,it is quite likely that at that time he was the only person at all qualified for the position.

And here it may be noted how differently Origen's early life was invested in comparison with the youthful periods of other great church Fathers,of those early days,e.g.Tertullian,Cyprian, Augustine,and Jerome!From childhood to old age Origen never deviated from his sole allegiance to truth as he had found it in Christ,so that in all the annals of the Christian Church there is no other life that exhibits a deeper devotion to the things of God than that of Origen. Yet this consecration was more of an individual matter between his own soul and Christ,than a devotion to the interests of the organized church;the inner fire that invited martyrdom in boyish days was never quenched;he would rather adventure with God than occupy an episcopal chair!Thus his service for Christianity was marked by an irreduceable individuality which must always distinguish him as more of a Non-Conformist than a typical church Father.

This is evident in the spirit with which he entered on his new duties.It was to be a labor of love,not a means of livelihood(a).By selling his precious manuscripts he was able to obtain the scanty pittance on which to be independent(b),taking as his guide the literal meaning of Matt.10-10.Herein he pays tribute to the ascetic values of his age,which,in later days,

developed into the various phases of Monasticism. But Origen's asceticism was only a means for service to his fellow men,not of separation from them.

At this period of his life the literalistic interpretation of Scripture seems to have commended itself to him,in striking contrast to his later enthusiasm for allegory.Literalism in Bible exposition is the natural view for enthusiastic youth,its absurdities and impossibilities become manifest only in the way of experience and larger study. Evidently the sane attitude of Clement towards asceticism did not take hold on the more ardent ambitions of his pupil.Origen was thorough-going in all his enterprises;his obedience to what seemed to him Scriptural leading was given with a wholeheartedness that may well condone even the folly of that self-mutilation,carried out in adhesion to a mistaken interpretation of Matt.I9-I2(a).

Such consecration to one's profession,united to an unusual mental equipment,was a guarantee of success".In spite of the persecution,students flocked in increasing numbers to sit at the feet of Origen"(b),and,as there were present in his classes those who were well versed in the teachings of heathen philosophy,he deemed it his duty also to study closely such teachings as were cognate,though opposed,to his own instruction.Following the example of Pantaenus and his own pupil Heraclas he attended the lectures in the University so as to learn at first-hand those religious-philosophical theories which he found it necessary to discuss in his own classroom.

Ammonius Saccas,founder of Neo-Platonism,was at that time one of the outstanding teachers of Alexandria,and it is usually assumed by historians,e.g.G.F.Moore,Inge,Fairweather(c),

that in his classes Origen familiarised himself with the latest development in religious philosophy.Porphyry,indeed,definitely calls Origen a pupil of Ammonius Saccas(a),but this witness is held worthless by Bigg,who also classifies Eusebius,on this subject as equally unreliable(b).However,his own assertion that Porphyry could not have known Origen seems to lack balance, for if Porphyry was born in 233 A.D.it was quite possible for him to have met Origen,as he says he did at Tyre,before the latter's death in 254 A.D. But it certainly seems impossible that they met in the classroom of Ammonius Saccas,as stated by Cruttwell(c) seeing that Origen had left Alexandria finally before Porphyry was born! Plotinus,however,may have been a fellow-student with Origen,and possibly may have heard him lecture;in any case it is suggestive that in his own lectures,years afterwards in Rome,the great Neo-Platonist makes no attack on the Christianity of Which Origen was both teacher and representative. In this he differs from his pupil and successor,Porphyry.

After the decease of Severus(2II A.D.)and the consequent cessation of persecution,Origen,in the interests of his health and for a touch of larger fellowship,visited Rome.There, apart from the fellowship with Hippolytus,a kindred scholarly worker,it is not likely that he found any spiritual inspiration. The Roman See was too much of a political organization to offer inducements for a lengthy stay to one of Origen's spiritualising tendencies. So he returned to Alexandria.

Shortly after resuming his duties in the Catechetical School he appears to have called in Heraclas as associate,in order that his own time might be devoted to the more advanced students,as well as to the study of Hebrew(d),the need of which

was more and more evident in the effort to exegete the Old Testament.From whom he received instruction in this language is not known;that he does not claim a profound knowledge of it is seen in the fact that he often referred his difficulties to the judgement of Jewish proselytes (a)".At the same time the extant fragments of his great work,the Hexapla, s now that he had no mean acquaintance with the traditional usage of the language(b).

Of his visit to Arabia,in answer to an invitation from the Roman governor,we have no details.It demonstrates,however,the widespread fame which learning and Christian zeal had brought to Alexandria's great ascetic scholar.Eusebius simply records that he "accomplished the objects of his journey"(c). But of his visit to Palestine,in 216 A.D.,to which he had withdrawn to escape the mad fury of Caracalla,there is more information.Bishop Alexander of Jerusalem and Bishop Theoctistus of Caesarea,filled with admiration for the most learned teacher in the Church,requested him to expound the Scriptures in their presence before a Christian assembly.Although only a layman Origen complied,and thereby greatly angered his High Churchly superior in Alexandria,bishop Demetrius.To this narrow minded ecclesiastic it was little short of sacrilege for a layman,no matter how uncommonly gifted he might be,to instruct his anointed superiors in things divine!He therefore addressed a heated remonstrance to his brother bishops of Palestine,and peremptorily ordered his distinguished catechist to return to his proper work!

This is the sort of absurd clerical egotism that has always been in evidence in all the centuries since,and which would refuse the "sacred" pulpit to the Nazarene Himself were He to appear as the humble carpenter of Galilee!It also suggests that Demetrius

had no objection to Origen's work and fame so long as it added to the glory of Alexandria and its bishop;it was only when outsiders showed more appreciation for Origen than he himself had done that this narrow minded bigot found cause for fault-finding.

In the years that immediately followed this incident the friendship between Origen and Ambrosius probably began.Ambrosius seems to have been adherent of the Valentinian heresy,but through Origen's efforts had been brought into the Christian faith(a). For Origen and the Church also this new addition to membership in the church was an event of immense importance.Rich and intelligent Ambrosius looked upon Origen as a very oracle of God,and henceforth unstintedly devoted himself and his wealth to his spiritual master's literary enterprises.For these he generously furnished all the necessary money as well as all the needed help for writing(b).Under such favouring conditions the literary activity of the succeeding years must have been prodigious(c),and probably the happiest period of Origen's whole life.

It was during this time that Origen was invited to visit the queen-mother,Julia Mammaea,who had heard of his fame and desired to confer with such a master.He was honourably escorted from Alexandria to Antioch,where he remained some time, "exhibiting innumerable illustrations of the glory of the Lord, and of the excellence of divine instruction,and then hastened back to his accustomed studies"(d).

Origen's next journey was into Greece,and involved two years' absence from Alexandria(228-230).The reason for this long journey and mission is given by Eusebius,somewhat vaguely,as "the pressing need of ecclesiastical affairs"(e),but this is generally understood to refer to heretical trouble,for the eradication of

which they sought the help of the noted teacher.Provided with credentials from his bishop Origen set out by way of Palestine. Here his friends,the bishops of Jerusalem and Caesarea,possibly by way of increasing his prestige for such a mission,perhaps as a rebuke to Demetrius for withholding the honour so long,saw fit to ordain Origen a Presbyter.

The new Presbyter then proceeded on his journey,restored harmony in Achaia,and returned by way of Ephesus and Antioch.At the former place he seems to have also acted as a doctrinal arbiter;in fact,wherever he went he appears to have been granted a sort of "moral episcopacy".Fairweather thinks that it was the payment of such "informal" episcopal honours to Origen that was the real cause of the jealousy of his own bishop.In any case Demetrius had so stirred up the feelings of the "orthodox" Alexandrians that,on his return,Origen relised the impossibility of continuing his work amid such hostility.Seeing "that a residence in his own native city was no longer possible" (a) Origen voluntarily left the city(251).

Such a conciliatory conclusion of the matter did not suit the angry passions of the vindictive Demetrius.By the aid, first,of the Egyptian Synod,and then through the action of a "packed" court he had Origen excluded from the Alexandrian church and deposed from the rank of Presbyter.The decision was then sent to other leading churches,in a circular letter,and such was the strength of ecclesiasticism even then that,in the West,where little or nothing was known of the matter,the judgement was approved,while in the East,where Origen was well known,the dioceses of Palestine,Phoenicia,Arabia,Greece,and Cappadocia,refused their consent.Needless to say Rome heartily concurred.

The charges of heresy upon which Demetrius based his demand(a) were too belated to hide the real cause.It is rather a reflect- upon a bishop that he allowed a heretic to teach in his school for more than twenty five years before calling him to account!

The treatise dealing with this whole matter and presenting Origen's side of the question,written by Eusebius and Pamphilus, has been lost(b),so that the facts are only partially known. It seems strange justice,however,and stranger Christianity,that the Palestinian bishops who,as officials and superiors,were surely most to blame,if blame there was,received no official censure! Harnack sums up the matter thus:"Origen's ordination was undoubtedly an infringement of the rights of the Alexandrian bishop;at the same time it was simply a piece of spite on the part of the latter that had kept Origen so long without any ecclesiastical consecration"(c).

Fortunately for the peace of the Church Origen was too great a man to create a schism in the church over his personal wrongs.One may wonder what Jerome would have done under like provocation?Caesarea became his new home and speedily the location of another great school of theology,thus Alexandria's loss became Palestine's gain,for Heraclas,more politic in orthodoxy, who succeeded to leadership in the Alexandrian school,was far from being in the class of his old teacher.

Caesarea thus grew into a spiritual centre to which men flocked for instuction;of these the most notable was that Gregory,who has left us his impressions of Origen as a teacher in his noble,if somewhat rhetorical,Panegyric,and who afterwards, as a bishop,became known as Thaumaturgus. During the persecution under Maximin,Origen withdrew to the refuge of the Cappadocian

Caesarea,where his friend,Firmilian,was bishop,and there in the home of the Christian Juliana,he lived in strict concealment for two years.In this home was the library and writings of Symmachus,the Ebionite Greek translator of the Old Testament, and the use of these MSS.proved a welcome windfall to Origen in his Biblical recension work.

The murder of Maximin ,in 238 A.D.,put an end to this period of persecution,and Origen was able to return to Caesarea,and to his former activities.Daily lectures on the Bible were supplemented by the zealous prosecution of exegetical and critical labours,indeed",the bulk of his exegetical work seems to have been done during the Caesarean period (231-249).Yet he appears to have been able to carry on his literary work wherever he chanced to be;his treatise "On Martyrdom" was written during his exile in Cappadocia,and,on a second visit to Greece ,somewhere in this period of his life,he completed the Commentary on Ezekiel and began that on the Song of Songs(a).

Other noteworthy incidents in those years were the peacemaking visit to Bostra,in Arabia,and his correspondence with the Emperor,Philip the Arabian,and his wife Severa. Beryllus,bishop of Bostra,in opposition to Elkesaite tenets, had taken a Patrpassian attitude in regard to the Godhead,and had been condemned by his synod for holding such a view.But while able to condemn they could not convince him of his error,and so Origen was called upon.The result was eminently successful; not only did Beryllus recant(b),he is also said to have,later, sent a letter of thanks to Origen for the service(c).

The downfall of the friendly emperor,Philip,in 249, gave the imperial throne for a brief apace to a pronounced

enemy of Christianity.Under Decius a systematic effort was made to extirpate the new faith,and in this plan all prominent Christians were specially marked for destruction. Under these circumstances it was impossible for Origen to escape.In 25I A.D. he was seized,imprisoned and brutally tortured(a).The death of the emperor in the same year saved Origen from the stake,but "although he survived his imprisonment,his body was so weakened by his sufferings,that he died at T re in 254 A.D.,in the seventieth year of his age(b).There also he was buried,and his resting place behind the high altar of the church in Tyre was an object of honour for generations,the memory of his greatness still lingering about a spot where even the fame of the great Emperor, Frederic Barbarossa,has long been forgotten.It is said that in those last days of suffering Origen received an invitation from Bishop Dionysius,his one-time pupil,to return to Alexandria(c). If so,the invitation came too late,and the old relations between Alexandria and her distinguished son were never renewed.

Such then was the tragic yet triumphant close to a life almost superhuman in its devotion to learning in the interest of Christian truth.Singularly devoid of personal ambition he toiled,a willing slave,for more than fifty years without thought of earthly honours or emoluments,looking to God alone for guidance and reward. As a pioneer theologian he naturally wandered far afield;he was too honest and earnest to avoid questions which might be considered too difficult and dangerous.But in so doing Origen carefully disclaimed any dogmatic infallibility; his theories were presented as suggestions rather than as dogmas.

But he never wandered from God,nor permitted his theories to impugn the Divine Goodness.When"betrayed in the house of his

friends"he exhibited a forbearance hard to match in all the annals of the Church,although no one showed more courage in the testing time of persecution.The Melancthon of his age he was both misunderstood and harshly condemned by those whose minds were warped and diseased by an overdose of static ecclesiasticism.

Heretic he might be according to later standards,but in his life as teacher,preacher,and peacemaker,none of his judges ever exhibited the same degree of real saintliness or consecrated scholarship as the man they condemned.In fact Origen's life in itself is a rich heritage and forms an inspiring contribution to the Christian Church.

With this life as a luminous background we shall now take up in more detail the work Origen accomplished and the great principles for which he contended with unexampled fidelity and learning.

Origen "bore the surname of Adamantios,which has been supposed by some to point to the irresistible force of his arguments,and by others to his own diligence"(a).Its appropriateness is evident when the amount and character of his writings are considered.Nothing less than an adamantine will,consecration,and bodily physique,could account for such colossal results."Coming as he did a generation after Clement,he fell upon an age which was seeking to define and justify,in speculative terms,the doctrine of the Christian Trinity"(b)."Clement was an aphoristic thinker,Origen a systematic"(c),and the task of systematising the fluid concepts of his age was,in itself,a tremendous enterprise.

A vast amount of mental effort had already been expended in the attempt to unite Christian truths and the higher ideas of Greek philosophy.The Jewish-Alexandrian school had shown the possibilities,and Pantaenus with Clement had applied a similar plan to the harmonizing of their own faith and philosophy.For the same purpose those church Fathers,known as the Apologists, had engaged in "the marvellous attempt to present Christianity to the world as the religion which is the true philosophy,and as the philosophy which is the true religion"(d).

It was therefore a rich heritage to which Origen fell heir,but that richness,both in quality and quantity,presented the strongest reason for its sifting and arrangement in a more systematic plan. To this encyclopedic task Origen addressed himself,and in its execution produced an almost unbelievable quantity of literature.This is certainly true if we accept the statement by Epiphanius that Origen wrote 6.000 volumes(e)! This is either a great exaggeration,or it is derived by counting every separate treatise,no matter how small,as a separate volume.

However, Jerome's question, "Which of us can read all that he has written" (a), is a sufficient testimony to the magnitude of Origen's literary labours. Many of his writings have perished, and much of what remains comes to us in the none too accurate translation by Rufinus (b). His literary activity begins after he had found in Ambrosius the necessary spur and material means; this partnership probably began about 218 A.D., so we may infer that Origen's writing was done in the last thirty years of his life.

Origen-Textual Critic.

In the department of Biblical Criticism Origen was as much a pioneer as he was in that of systematic Theology. Of his contribution to N.T. Criticism Westcott and Hort make the following estimate: "Another great landmark is furnished by the writings of Origen, which carry us to the middle of the third century, and even earlier. They establish the prior existence of at least three types of text, which can be identified through numerous readings distinctively attested by characteristic groups of extant documents" (c). On another page the same authorities add this testimonial, "The perpetuation of the purer text may in great measure be laid to the credit of the watchful scholars of Alexandria" (d).

It is evident therefore that although Origen made no recension of the New Testament, such as he attempted for the Old Testament in the Hexapla (e), yet, as an exegete, he was compelled to take note of the corruptions then existing in the N.T. text, "some arising from the carelessness of scribes, some from the evil licence of emendation, some from arbitrary omissions or interpolations" (f). Both his exacting scholarship and the real necessity for the best text on which to found his comments, led him to the careful yet cautious examination of the various

manuscripts in their different readings.And in this work Origen exhibited less boldness than some of his contemporaries.Probably this caution was due to his high inspirational views of Scripture,thus many of his textual conjectures,presented in his commentaries,are not admitted into his text(a).In his exegetical studies he did not confine himself to one family of N.T.MSS, a fact noted by Griesbach,who points out that,while Origen uses a Western text for his commentary on Matthew,that on John is based upon an Alexandrine(b).

Origen recognised that the first step towards a proper understanding of the New Testament was the establishment of a correct text,and his honest recognition of conflicting readings in different manuscripts of the New Testament,and of the need of a careful comparison of such sources,was,as Cruttwell states, in itself,the first real advance towards a true N.T textual criticism(c).However,all that Origen attempted to do was to purify his own MS,or MSS.and "this he effected with care and ability" (d).The results of his labours were embodied in the "Exemplaria Adamantii"which acquired an authoritative standing,all the more from the fact that a copy was presented by Eusebius to the Emperor Constantine.Origen's ideas of the verbal inspiration of Scripture did not prevent him,as it does with so many of the worshippers of the King James Version today,from seeing that continual transcription of the original writings by many different hands had resulted in numerous divergencies,and that real reverence for the sacred Word is not shown by blindly clinging to the customary and traditional,but,rather,by the testimony of all the literary witnesses to obtain,as far as possible,the textual Golden Mean.As the pioneer in this courageous method of treating

such problems Origen at least pointed the way to a sane and fruitful examination of those differences which demand the exercise of honest N.T.criticism.

But Origen's fame as a critic rests chiefly upon his O.T. work,the Hexapla."Origen's textual studies in the Old Testament were undertaken partly in order to improve the MSS.tradition, and partly for apologetic reasons ,to clear up the relation between the Septuagint and the original Hebrew text"(a)"On this undertaking he is said to have spent eight and twenty years of his life,and to have acquired a knowledge of Hebrew in order to qualify himself for the task"(B).The Septuagint was the creation of the Jewish Hellenists of Egypt,and for long enjoyed great popularity,not only among Hellenistic Jews but even among those of Palestine as well.But its extensive use in establishing Christian truth against the claims of Judaism,the Jews began to repudiate it as a mutilation of the Hebrew writings ,and gave preference to other translations,especially to that of Aquila,which was more literalistic.

Traces of disputes between Jews and Christians regarding the Septuagint occur as early as Justin's time(c),and by the time of Origen the inaccuracy of the Septuagint as a translation had become a stock-argument by Jewish controversialists.That the charge was not without foundation Origen soon discovered.His collation of Septuagint MSS,made possible through the munificence of Ambrosius, "revealed an amount of wanton divergence that rendered it impossible to arrive at the true text by mere comparison of MSS".(d).Had he not been hampered by his belief,shared by many other Christians of that day,that the Hebrew text had been tampered with by the later Jews(e),his task would have been a

new translation.But the handicap of his distrust of the Jewish guardians of the Hebrew text closed the door to this direct mode of correcting the Septuagint text,and led him to adopt a more complicated and laborious method.

The existence of several Greek translation of the Old Testament other than the Septuagint,and much later,suggested to Origen the course he followed in producing his gigantic work, the Hexapla.The translations used by him were those of Aquila, Jewish proselyte of Sinope,Theodotion,an Ebionite of Ephesus, and Symmachus,an Ebionite of Samaritan extraction(a).Of these the oldest and most literal was that of Aquila(reign of Hadrian), that by Symmachus was the most recent and elegant in literary style,while Theodotion supplied a new translation of Daniel which entirely superseded the older Alexandrian version of that book.Yet all three were,more or less,written by way of proving the Jewish contention regarding the Septuagint's inaccuracy.It may not have been unlikely then that such translations sought to diminish the force of the O.T.Messianic prophecies ,an illustration of which is noted by Irenaeus in their treatment of Isaiah 7-I4(b).

This view was probably not wanting in Origen when he gave them a place in the Hexapla alongside of the older Septuagint,for besides emendation of that text he may have also wished to show,by way of this comparison,the superiority of the older Alexandrian text(c).For such a comparison the contents of the Hexapla were uniquely arranged."The first column to the right contained the Hebrew text,the second the same text transliterated into Greek,the third the translation of Aquila,the fourth that of Symmachus,the fifth the Septuagint,and the sixth the

version of Theodotion"(a).While the entire Old Testament is thus dealt with,certain parts of it were set down in two,or even three, additional columns drawn from several anonymous versions discovered by Origen(b).

In the task of textual emendation "he inserted critical marks in the text of the Septuagint,an asterisk to denote what ought to be added,and an obelus to denote what ought to be omitted, taking the additions chiefly from the version of Theodotion"(c). In addition,Origen also published the four Greek versions by themselves,an edition known as the Tetrapla(d),but whether this smaller work preceded or followed the Hexapla is undecided.It was altogether an unparalleled achievment;one wonders how,with all his other labours,Origen could possibly have accomplished it! The whole is said to have extended to nearly fifty volumes,a library in itself,a momument to Origen's erudition and consecration.It is therefore no doubt true,as stated by one writer,that "The Hexapla was long the glory of the church of Caesarea"(e), and its destruction by the Arabs in 653 A.D.is properly estimated by Guericke when he says "The loss of Origen's critical investigations is the severest that has befallen the department of Biblical Science"(f).

The work as a whole seems never to have been transcribed,but numerous fragments are found in the writings of later Church Fathers,and these surviving remains serve as samples of the vast whole(g).The column,however,containing the version of the Septuagint had been copied by Pamphilus and Eusebius(beginning of the fourth century),along with its diacritical signs, and circulated broadcast among the churches of Palestine.The great scholar,Jerome,seems to have found it of considerable use(h).

Origen-The Exegete.

In this department Origen's labours are equally prodigious,and range over nearly the entire field of Scripture.His exegetical work is presented under three modes of exposition,(I) Scholia, brief notes,mostly grammatical,upon obscure and difficult passages;(2) Homilies,or expository lectures which aimed at edification.Of these some 200 are still extant.(3) Commentaries,wherein his peculiar system of interpretation finds ample scope for exercise,although this is also true,within more popular limits, of the Homilies.

"Of these works not much has been preserved in the Greek original,but considerable portions are extant in Latin translations by Rufinus and Jerome"(a).Of Origen's numerous writings it will be remembered that Jerome expressed himself as most captivated by the exposition of the Songs of Songs,"declaring that while Origen in his other works surpassed all writers,he in the Song of Songs surpassed even himself"(b).But that was said before Jerome and Rufinus had their final quarrel!

On account of the necessarily narrow limits of this discussion,as well as the fact that a complete list of Origen's works is inserted at the close of this chapter,only the principal commentaries can be given notice here,as this will suffice to call attention to such exegetical merits which form no small part of Origen's general contribution in the development of an intelligent Christianity.

As a commentator Origen is at his best in the New Testament."If in handling the Septuagint he was hampered by his imperfect knowledge of Hebrew,he was under no such disability with reference to the New Testament.The Greek grammar and language he

knew as thoroughly as any Greek scholar of his time"(a).His greatest production of this type is generally conceded to be that on John's Gospel.It was probably his first undertaking at the request of Ambrosius(b),as well as his own choice,for to John's Gospel Origen assigns primacy among the Gospels (c),because of its emphasis upon the Divinity of the Logos;also,he may have been stimulated thereto by the example and erroneous exposition of his Gnostic predecessor,Herakleon.

Partly written in Alexandria it was finally completed in Caesarea,some years after the close of the persecution under Maximin,and seems to have consisted of thirty-nine books. Of these less than ten survive(d).Such a huge work suggests an almost unlimited breadth of treatment,an illustration of which is seen in the fact that the first two books only cover the first seven verses of the Gospel!

The commentaries on Romans and Matthew were written in the last ten years of his life.That on Romans has come to us largely by way of the translation by Rufinus,who seems to have taken considerable liberties with the original in the interests of orthodoxy,so that it is difficult to know which ideas are his or Origen's(e).The Commentary on Matthew originally consisted of twenty-five books;the first nine are practically lost,the remaining portions survive partly in Greek and part in Latin.Written about the same time as his Contra Celsum,this work represents Origen's maturer views(f).It is interesting to note that on Matt. I9-I0-I2 he does not hesitate to retract those earlier views which led to his youthful indiscretion(g).

"To us,though not to himself nor to the men of his age, Origen's merit as an expositor rests mainly upon the skill and

patience with which he evolved the real and natural sense of the Bible.In relation to his own age his services are extraordinary. He took great pains to ascertain the text;he insists on the necessity of fixing the precise meaning of the words.He never slurs a difficulty,raising and discussing every doubt that can by any possibility suggest itself"(a).

This critical fearlessness of Origen may be briefly illustrated by calling attention to his discussion on the names "Bethany" and "Bethabara" (John.I-28) and his preference of the the latter(b),his arguments on the chronological difficulties involved in John's statement(John.4.35),"There are yet four months,and then cometh the harvest"(c),and last,but not least, his frank presentation of the discrepancies between the Evangelists,and how such contradictions can be explained by the mystical and spiritual interpretation(d).That Origen often raises questions of this character,even although he fails to solve them in a satisfactory manner,presents the curious fact that in Origen one sees the paradoxical combination of the greatest allegorist and the keenest and most daring of textual critics!This combination of two extremes in one man and its results are stated by Foakes-Jackson as follows:"Origen,the most allegorical interpreter of Scripture,laid the foundation of a sounder method of study,which became the glory of the school of Antioch"(e).

It should be observed,however,that there is a close connection as well as a striking contrast between those two apparently contradictory traits in this great church Father. His was not an age when the idea of a progressive revelation of divine truth had any standing in the church.It is true that Origen approaches this modern view of revelation when he assigns

a pre-eminence to the Gospels among other Scriptures,and a similar pre-eminence to John's Gospel over the Synoptics(a),but failed to apply this rule in the more radical sense.The Church as a whole had fully accepted the Jewish notion of Old Testament verbal inspiration,and to this concept Origen adheres(b).But he does so in a manner similar to that of Philo,who shows in a truly masterly way how such a rigid standard of inspiration can be professed,and,at the same time,how it can be attenuated,if not entirely evaporated,by the application of allegorical interpretation.

Allegorism had become a commonplace practice when Origen adopted it as the key to Scripture;he merely applied it in a more systematic and thorough manner(c).As a Platonist to him all things seen are but suggestions of the unseen,and this is as true of the words of Scripture as elsewhere."We have the treasure in earthern vessels"which are only of value because of their contents.The Bible is a book of "Wisdom in a mystery"(d),the husk of words must be "allegorised"in order to discover the truly spiritual message."For as man consists of body,and soul,and spirit,so in the same way does Scripture"(e),thus it has a threefold meaning,corresponding in importance to body,soul,and spirit. His estimate of their comparative value can be appreciated by quoting his own words:"For,with respect to Holy Scripture,our opinion is that the whole of it has a "spiritual",but not the whole a "bodily" meaning,because the bodily meaning is in many places proved to be impossible"(f).

Origen held that innumerable passages in both Testaments have no sense at all except as Allegories.It has been seen already how Philo freely rejects as incredible anthropomorphic

concepts of God(a) in obedience to the philosophic rule that "nothing unworthy of God must be believed".Origen applies the standard of reason to the Scripture narratives,both in the Old and New Testaments.Whatever appears physically or morally impossible,or offensive to the enlightened conscience,he declares are untrue(b).These are "stumbling blocks"purposely introduced to discourage dependence on the letter,and to develop the student's spiritual insight."The letter is the external garb,often sordid and torn,but "the king's daughter is all glorious within"(c).

This mode of cleansing the Scriptures might be called a war measure.The Gnostic held that the unscientific,barbaric, and unethical elements in the Old Testament were proofs that it was the production of some lower being than God,and unworthy of respect,and it is by way of rebuttal that Origen such elements are but mere scaffolding,and only suggestions of the true Mysteries within.Thus,with Philo,Origen is able by the use of Allegory,negative as well as positive,to retain the theory of a verbal inspiration,and yet,at the same time,to castigate his Gnostic opponents for their lack of that spiritual gnosticism which is able to discriminate between the letter and the spirit.Also,it becomes evident that Allegorism,as thus practiced,offered a large freedom,if not an invitation,in the exercise of textual criticism,as well as in the fields of exposition and theology.And no study of Origen's writings can yield much satisfaction unless his magical use of Allegory is given unusually large credit. It is a mark of his spiritual genius that he saw the defects , and fearlessly grappled with them,his faulty solution has at least the merit of glorifying the spirit rather than the letter.

Origen's Scriptural Canon?

The word "Canonical" as descriptive of the books of the Bible is unknown to Origen(a).His list of Old Testament books given by Eusebius(b)agrees,indeed,in respect of number,though not of order, with the Hebrew Canon,yet in common with the Greek Fathers generally he frequently quotes the Apocrypha as authoritative(c). His lack of careful research in this field is illustrated by his argument with Julius Africanus concerning the "Susanna"addition to Daniel(d).

With Origen the New Testament was still less of a fixed quantity than the Old.In general he follows ecclesiastical sanction as to canonicity,but exercises an independent judgement in using whatever writings appeal to himself.Thus "The Gospel of the Hebrews he prized highly because it teaches that the Holy Ghost is the mother of the Lord"(e);he also quotes from the Epistles of Barnabas,Clement,and Hermas,as of valid authority in establishing his arguments(f).

On the other hand,Origen doubted the canonicity of 2 Peter,and of 2 and 3 John,and considered the claims of Jude superior to those of the Epistle of James(g).Thus Origen's theory of the comparative or different degrees of inspiration of different books naturally shades off the clear-cut distinction between canonical and instructive writings,While therefore Origen held that all Scriptures are "divine writings",he was able to see that this "divinity"was not equally distributed among the different books,and "in this we may trace the first beginnings of that distinction between Scripture and the Word of God which has bulked so largely in modern theology"(h).

Origen-The Apologist.

Origen's great apologetical work was the treatise undertaken at the special request of his friend Ambrosius, in answer to the attack of the heathen philosopher, Celsus, on the Christian religion, in a work which he entitled A True Discourse(a). This True Discourse appears to have been written during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, but remained unanswered until a copy fell into the hands of Ambrosius, who then urged Origen to make a reply to its arguments(b). This Origen undertook reluctantly as he held that Christian life itself was the best refutation to attacks on the Christian faith, and is careful to state that "this book has been composed not for those who are thorough believers, but for such as are either wholly unacquainted with the Christian faith, or for those who are "weak in the faith"(c).

Origen's refutation is entitled Contra Celsum, consists of eight books, and was probably written at Caesarea in reign of Philip the Arabian(244-249). "It has always been regarded as the great apologetic work of antiquity; and no one can peruse it without being struck by the multifarious reading, wonderful acuteness, and rare subtlety of mind which it displays" (d). In this great work against Celsus, Origen has quoted so much of his opponent's book that we are able to obtain a good idea of its contents. The True Discourse, thus preserved, is of "inestimable value historically, because it enables us to see in what light Christianity was regarded by the most cultivated heathens of the second century"(e). We are also given a sketch of the religion professed by this type of philosophic heathen.

The author of The True Discourse was undoubtedly a Platonist(f), though Origen charges him with masking Epicurean-

ism under the garb of Platonism(a).In any case he was no mean opponent;Fisher calls him "the ablest of its(Christianity's) assailants"(b).It is impossible here to give even a synopsis of this great apologetic,such as is presented in vol.4,Ante-Nicene Fathers,p.681ff;it is sufficient to say that both bitterness and skill mark this anti-Christian polemic,wherein he "anticipates many of the scientific arguments used against Christianity in modern times"(c).

The Christian scheme of Redemption naturally draws his hottest denunciation,but he does not fail to call attention to the illegal standing of Christian societies,nor to pour scorn upon the claims of Jews as well as Christians(d).However,he fails to discriminate between "the church' beliefs and those of heretics (e).Origen's plan of action is to answer each objection as it is presented,and while this may have saved his time it has the opposite effect upon readers.

There is naturally much in common between the two Platonic debaters,yet there is much more that divides them.The one is all for Christ,to the other Christ as God is utterly preposterous.But to the scorn and cry of "failure" Origen insists on emphasising the dynamic growth of the despised faith(f).This is the incontrovertible refutation of failure.And Celsus realizes it,therefore he closes his diatribe by asking for a truce! Why not serve two masters?(g)why not be one of us?

That Origen's Contra Celsum took high rank in those early days is seen in the testimony of Eusebius who speaks of it "as a refutation of all objections,actual or possible,past or future" (h),and in modern days Fisher says "a masterly defence of Christianity",a proof of Origen's hold on the essential verities(i).

Origen's Theology.

It remains to say something of Origen's scheme of theological thought.It might be more lightly passed over if its importance were estimated by the number of its adherents;for few probably, even in his own day,adopted it throughout. But as the first example of a Christian system,as a powerful mental and spiritual ferment in later ages,and as a definite Christian philosophy intended to meet the dangers and satisfy the needs of his own time Origen's theological contribution takes a leading part in the development of Christian thought.

"Of Origen's dogmatic works there is only one complete specimen extant,namely,the De Principiis(On The Fundamentals). It is,however,a work of first-rate importance,being indeed the most notable production of the Ante-Nicene age"(a).Unfortunately our knowledge of its contents is mostly derived through the Latin translation by Rufinus,who followed the method adopted by Jerome in his translation of the Homilies,that,namely,of excising or amending heterodox statements.Rufinus believed that the original text had been malevolently corrupted by heretics,hence his effort to eliminate such changes or interpolations,in behalf of the great theologian's reputation,was born of a generous intention, but its too free exercise leaves readers in doubt as to what is Origen's and what is due to Rufinus.

Happily,however,the original text of considerable portions of Books 3 and 4,in Greek,have been preserved;also comparisons can be made with statements in the Philocalia-a selection of "choice thoughts" from his works jointly compiled by Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzen-,as well as with fragments from Photius and Pamphilus.By means of this comparative

study,and by statements found in other Origenistic works,the overly officious work of the translator has been largely corrected.

Written about 228-230 A.D. this is one of his earlier works,yet by no means a product of immature thinking;rather,his challenge to a time of too much disconnected discussion.The cause of much of his later troubles in theological circles he evidently did not intend it for a declaration of independent thought;he plants himself on the Regula Fidei of his church(a).This,however, was by no means sufficient as a creed,much less as a system of theology.In its limited content there was looseness of definition; in addition,there was left many questions untouched.To Origen the need of more discriminating defintion was evident,the nebulosity of Christian teaching left too many openings for attack by Gnostic and Monarchian alike.And Origen was not the man to avoid or evade; without dogmatism but with unusual daring and originality he attacks the questions that bear upon the nature and relations of the Divine and human(b).

Taking the Rule of Faith and the Scriptures as the only legitimate avenues of approach Origen sought to construct such a philosophy of religion as would be both systematic in arrangement of thought,and capable of presenting Christianity as superior to its various competitors. Between Origen and his teacher, Clement,there was substantial sympathy in their theology(c);the pupil's work was largely to put system into his teacher's loosely arranged material,but in their philosophic affiliations there is a marked distinction. Clement was an eclectic in philosophy,Origen a Platonist,or,possibly,a Neo-Platonist in thought and allegiance. And this philosophic colouring runs through his theology(d).

The objective of the Neo-Platonists,an eclectic system in which all forms of philosophy and religion might be harmonised,commended itself to a mind like Origen's,with its insatiate thirst for a system which should embrace all things in heaven and earth. This wide-sweeping,philosophic phase of Origen's mind will account for much of his speculative thought.

The purpose of this discussion is,however,not a review of his whole theological system,but merely to call attention to such conclusions in it as directly influenced,positively or negatively, the church's history in succeeding centuries.For although Origen's theology,as a whole,never became that of the church,its encyclopedic character was such "that all subsequent theology has been pleased to link itself on to one side or the other of his rich spiritual heritage"(a).

In his definition of God,Origen is practically at one with Philo and Clement.Yet there are differences.God as the "incomprehensible"is thoroughly so in Clement's mind,but Origen is more positive."Before we can know what He is not,we must know what He is;the titles Good,Wise,Just,which we apply to Him,are inadequate but not untrue"(b).Origen puts in the forefront of his argument the "immateriality" of God(c)."This point,owing perhaps to the influence of Stoicism,had as yet been very imperfectly apprehended by the Church",even by such thinkers as Irenaeus and Tertullian(d),hence the value of Origen's emphasis.

God is devoid of "passions"in the ordinary meaning of that word..When Scripture attributes to Him wrath,hatred,repentance,it is only in condescension to our infirmities.Punishment is not His work,but the natural consequence of sin(e).But of the nobler passions He is not devoid."He has the passion of Love"(f).

Nor did Origen vision God as the Unconditioned, the Absolute, but as the Perfect. He is perfectly wise, perfectly just, perfectly mighty, but the perfection of these attributes consists precisely in the fact that they are limited by one another(a)." To a Platonist limitation is of the essence of truth and beauty, "infinite" means almost the same as "evil"(b).

This concept of God is the basis for Origen's peculiar views as to Creation. God must be Perfect in Action; Creator and Creation are correlative notions; the Divine perfection implies external realization. "In order to be righteous, in more than a potential sense, there must be things over which he can righteously rule"(c). To suppose a change in Him from the the potential to the active would be impious. So that Creation is eternal, yet it is "creation", not a Gnostic emanation(d). Origen may have had, as one reason for this emphasis, the Epicurean argument of Lucretius against Creation(e). "The same argument in Origen's mind proved the Eternal Generation of the Son and the eternity of Creation. Later theologians regarded it as admirable in the first case and abominable in the second!"(f). The doctrine of eternal Creation does not, however, imply that this world is eternal; the present world is but one in the creative procession(g). Nor does Origen allow the presence of evil here to impugn the wisdom of the Creator in forming this world(h). It is the best possible for His purpose, namely, the correction and discipline of those who had sinned in previous lives. Thus we see that the Goodness of God is the pivot around which Origen swings his whole system; from that Goodness all created things have come, and, spite of the creatures' declensions, thither all shall return. This world is but a house of correction, a stage on the homeward journey.

The age in which Origen lived was,theologically,a formative age, and as a consequence an age of keen religious controversy.The Christian Deity is One in Three.But the Church had not so far made any clear pronouncement on the relationship of the Three. Were the Three equally Divine or otherwise? To state such a question is to realise the temerity and irrepressible egotism of human beings,who although unable to even define themselves, yet did not hesitate in the attempt to dissect the Unseen and Unknowable!! But that was an age of "definition", when,as Hatch caustically suggests,"the decay of original thinking"had trans-philosophers into hairsplitting professors,and "words became fetishes".This was the Greek contribution to Christianity(a).

Whatever the cause or reason Church history in the early centuries largely centers about the efforts to define the intimate Mysteries of the Godhead,and Origen,during his visit to Rome(b),must have noted the high theological temperature created there by the necessity of opposing the Monarchianism of Noetus and Sabellius.According to their teachings while the One might exhibit Himself as Three,the real existence of the Three must be found solely in the One(c).Thus the Trinity was but the outward manifestation of the eternal Unity(d)

For Origen and the men of his time then the great object was to establish both the true Divinity and Personality of the Son and Holy Spirit,although more especially that of the Son, and with special emphasis upon Personality."The problem of the Unity was of course involved in this,but it was not the immediate point at issue;hence the phraseology on this side was less guarded and precise"(e).Thus it is in Origen's discussion of the Logos as the complete manifestation of the hidden Deity(f);he emphasises

the Son's co-eternity and distinct personality(a),but maintains a certain subordination of the Son to the Father.The Father is "God"with the article prefixed to the term:whereas the Son is God,with the article omitted(b).He is "the second God"(c),from the will of the Father(d),He is even called "the most ancient of all creatures"(e).

It is in such expressions as these that,at a later date, the Arians found satisfaction,yet the very watchword of Arianism: "There was(a time) when He was not"is positively contradicted by Origen in words which became the rallying cry for the opponents of Arius(f).Foakes-Jackson holds that Origen's Platonism is the basis of his subordinationist theory;anything generated must be inferior to its source(g).While this may contain some truth it must not be forgotten that Origen drew his proof from Scripture itself,even the very words of Jesus,"None is Good save One"(Luke, I8.I9),and "My Father is greater than I"(John I4-28).In this connection it is appropriate also to quote from Fairweather: "Strictly speaking,however,the subordination here taught by Origen is not a subordination of essence,but one of function in relation to the manifestation of the Persons of the Godhead to creatures; that is to say,the Son as Son is inferior to the Father as Father" (h).On the whole it seems evident that Origen intended to teach that in some sense the Son is in subordination to the Father,but as Scriptures themselves are by no means clear on this,possibly Origen felt he could do no better than associate himself with Paul who asserts "that then shall the Son also himself be subjected"(I Cor.I5-28).

That the mind of the Church was unable to endorse this particular view of Origen is no more a proof that he was wrong

therein than its endorsement of his views on Eternal Fatherhood and Eternal Generation proves that in these philosophic conclusions he was correct.But these latter suggestions were in line with the then popular trend which,in plain language, was a preference for a metaphysical,deified Christ as an object of homage,than for every day companionship with the Man of Galilee.Therefore anything suggestive of a subordinate Christ must be heresy!

Nevertheless Origen's service on behalf of orthodoxy was of the highest value. The questions raised by the terms "Logos endiathetos" and "Logos prophorikos"as applied to Christ by earlier writers are put out of court by Origen's doctrine of the Son's eternal generation(a),while his emphasis upon the immateriality of Deity,in accord with Neo-Platonism,helped to free the Church from those Stoic ideas of divinity which still existed.

In regard to the characteristics of the Son Origen distinguishes between the properties of His eternal Nature and those which are accretions,assumed for the purpose of Redemption. It is in respect of the latter that the Son is Many,while the Father is One(b).To the latter class belong Firstborn from the Dead,Light,Shepherd;to the former,Wisdom,Word,Life,Truth,and, following both Clement and Philo in their vision of the Higher and Lower Life,Origen divides Christians,by their knowledge of Christ's fundamental or acquired characteristics,into those ruled by Christ as God,and those ruled by Him as Man(c).

Origen's view of the God-Man is conditioned by his opinions of the pre-existence of the Soul and the nature of the resurrection body."He is the first to speak at large of the Human

Soul of Jesus"(a).Against the docetic opinion Origen is at pains to show that He is possessed of a human soul in inseparable unity with the Logos(b) This human soul was a pure,unfallen,pre-existent spirit,chosen on account of these qualities,and thus able to unite with and be infused by Divinity as iron and heat unite(c).Nevertheless the properties of the Two Natures remain in truth distinct(d)

The flesh of Jesus was pure from all birth stain,from defilement of every kind(e).Yet it was real flesh,His life,His passion were in no sense fantastic(f).So real was this physical body of Christ that Origen refused to accept in the literal sense the story of His being carried up into a mountain by the Tempter(g).He refused to accept the ancient view that the form of Jesus was wanting in beauty or dignity,he preferred the picture of Psalm 45 to that of Isaiah 53(h).But the Christ beauty was only visible to the spiritually minded,only to such as lacked that vision did he appear without grace or comeliness(i). Was this but a residuum of the docetism noted in Clement's conception ? Riggs inclines to that view."In this beautiful fancy we may perhaps recognise the last faint trace of Docetism"(j). Personally,however,we believe that there is more crass docetism in the orthodox doctrine of the Virgin Birth than in the above mild speculation by Origen!

The Resurrection body of Jesus was not the body of His earthly pilgrimage,it was the Glorified Body of which St Paul speaks(k),a fact borne out by the Scriptural history of the Master's resurrected body.In such Glorified fleshly habiliments He ascended "that He might endow with perpetual purity the pledge of our flesh which He had carried up with Him"(l).

"The Holy Spirit was associated in honour and dignity with the Father and the Son"(a),He is uncreated(b),His divinity is shown in the Baptismal formula and in Christ's definition of the sin unforgiveable(c).He is eternal(d),and His equality with the Father and Son is suggested by the three-fold ascription of "Holy" by the seraphim in Isaiah 6(e).His knowledge of God is direct ,not derived through the Son(f),He is to be invoked in prayer(g).It is He that in the beginning moved upon the face of the waters(h),and inspires the saints of the Old and New Testaments alike(i).

"But His special work is that of sanctification.The Father gives being to all that exists;the Son imparts reason,Logos,to all that is capable of it;the Holy Ghost works life in those that believe"(j)."But from the point of view of Origen's system the terms Father,Son,and Holy Spirit merely mark,as regards its three principal movements,the one though diverse activity of God"(k).Yet nowhere does Origen definitely bestow upon the Holy Spirit the title of God,in fact he seems to deny Him that honor in one passage(l),while in another(m) he wavers as to a decision whether or not the Spirit be not a "creation" by the Son.Thus as in the case of the Son whose Personality is emphasised at the expense of His equality,so with the Spirit in Origen's treatment."He is the first creation of the Father through the Son,and therefore subordinate to the Son,as the Son is to the Father"(n).

The religious philosophy of the Alexandrian Christian School with its principal doctrine of the immanent,all-pervasive, life and light giving Logos,had,as was the case with Philo also, no pressing need for the services of the Spirit,hence possibly Harnack is correct in assuming that Origen included the Holy

Spirit in his Trinity only as a gesture of accord with the "regula fidei",and because it was a part of Scripture teaching, rather than because his theological system required it(a).
As a conclusion to this review of Origen's Trinitarian theology, not overlooking its reverence for Scripture and its stimulating, speculative daring,the words of Gregory Nazianzen seem a fitting warning:"Speculate not upon the Divine Generation,for it is not safe.Let the doctrine be honoured silently.It is a great thing for thee to know the fact;the mode we cannot admit that even angels understand,much less thou(b).

"The picturesque peculiarities of Origen's thinking become more apparent when we go on to the doctrine of Creation"(c). Creation,as the word is commonly understood,was in Origen's view not the beginning,but an intermediate phase in human history. God has never been without a world of creatures;our world conditions are but tragic evidences of moral declension of spirits in previous worlds.For here,strange to say,Origen is in agreement with his life-long opponents,the Gnostics.With them the source of evil here was found in a pre-mundane Fall in the Pleroma,thus evil flows from precedent evil.With this general proposition Origen agrees when he argues that this world's is both the consequence and expiation of the Fall of "rational natures" in that other,earlier,and more ideal world he finds in the very opening words of Genesis(d).

But while the facts of life here led the Gnostic to adopt the theory of determinism or predestination Origen refused to follow a line of thought that seemed to him to so outrage and discredit the Goodness of the Creator.Instead of their pessimistic fatalism he emphasises Freedom of the Will in those who

fell from their first estate as rational spirits(a).In the exercise of this Freedom to choose they have become what they are, whether angels of glory or demons of wickedness(b).So with men. The pre-existent fall of men from holiness is not only pre-supposed in their present character from birth;it is the ground and reason of the existence of the material world(c),the scene of discipline.Thus Free Choice is enthroned by Origen as the cause of moral evil;it can also choose to return even from the depths of hell itself(d).Here then we see that Origen's theology is at the core a persistent optimism;in spite of declension the end will be as the beginning when "God shall be all in all".(e).

This is the key to his whole system;the ultimate triumph of Good in all created things is the goal to which the whole creation moves.And this universal sweep of restoring Grace naturally expands the scheme of Christ's Redemption."To Origen as to the Gnostics,as to Ignatius(f),the death of Jesus is a world-sacrifice"(g),the whole creation groaning and travailing will be restored to perfect harmony in Him.

As to original Sin pre-existence does not account for all of it ;Adam's sin affects the race,a thought which was suggested to Origen by the apostolic institution of Infant Baptism(h).But "total depravity" has no place in his system;Origen is the uncompromising foe of unconditional predestination,and his exegesis of passages which favour it are in general accord with modern Armenianism(i).

To Origen the history of God's revelations is progressive; the Natural Law,the Law of Moses,and the Gospel are the developments of this revelation.A Fourth,yet to come, is the Eternal Gospel of Revelation I4-6.As to the relative values of the First

three the Gospel is not the natural crown of Reason and the Law, but rather a remedy for their failure(a).

"Origen was the first among the early Fathers to elaborate a theory of the Atonement"(b).He surpasses Clement in his emphasis on the Cross and the Blood(c).Christ is our Ransom;by the offering of His human soul He bought us from and broke the powers of sin(d).The death of Christ is vicarious,it is a propitiation(e).His emphases on these features leads Harnack to remark that "Origen was the first to introduce into the Gentile church a theory of reconciliation and atonement"(f).

The redemptive influence of the Logos extends beyond this life,even Pharaoh is still an object of grace(g),and the esoteric doctrine of restitution of all who have sinned,not excluding Satan and his angels,is charged to Origen by Jerome(h).And this is in accord with Origen's general thought that it is more to the honour of God to triumph in Goodness than in punitive,vindictive Power!

In his application of Redemption Origen follows Clement in distinguishing between the Christ of the Christian Gnostic and Him of the imperfect Christian.To the former He is the Teacher, the Divine Reason,to the latter He is the God-Man."The Christ of the perfect is not of faith,but the Christ who dwells in us;not the Christ of history,but the Christ of experience"(i).

In contrast to the consentient teaching of the Church on the subject of rewards and punishment(j),presents a theory of gradual approach to the Divine presence,which lends itself largely to the later exploitation of Purgatory(k).Only a few are ready for perfection,hence even the good can move upward only as they are purged in the testing fires.Our own sins are the fuel,thus

one's punishment,medicinal not retibutive,is measured by the evil within(a).In that refining process whereby the soul is purged and fitted for the vision of God,the Judgement Day and Resurrection are but epochal stages,not the end of this discipline(b).The Resurrection body will be "germinatively" the same as our earthly bodies,but it is a body suited to another Aeon(c).This is Origen's mode of expressing the Pauline thought .The Individuality remains recognizable,but it is a new body.Chiliasm is emphatically condemned(d).

Thus Origen refuses to subscribe to popular concepts,he spiritualises too much for the average Christian.It is commonly charged against the Alexandrian theology that it is lacking in a proper visualisation of man's sin,yet in Origen's eschatology this is so emphasised as to offend the so-called orthodox!The theory that "the souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness,and do immediately pass into glory"is entirely too wholesale a transformation to have appealed to Origen.Such a statement has a fine democratic ring to it,but it entirely overlooks the comparative fitness in the various types of believers. According to Origen "it is only a small fraction of disciples to whom the door of blessedness in the vision of God is open immediately at death"(e),which shows that in reality it is the orthodox concept of sin that is the shallower.But apart from its Scriptural or merely philosophical proofs Origen's idea of the after life as simply an intenser discipline and a more agonizing persistence in the upward journey is now and always has been as unpalatable to the average Christian as it would be to the follower of Mahomet.Like James and John they feel quite sure that they "are able",so when Origen declares that at least nine-tenths of

all Christians,at death,are unfit to enter His presence,much less to enjoy it,he sank his theological craft upon the rocks of human prejudice.

"Ecclesiasticism was not Origen's strong point"(a).Here, as in his eschatology,he runs counter to popular thought.To him the Catholic Church is one only in a spiritual unity;the powers given to Peter are shared by all who have Peter's faith(b).He distinguishes between the Visible and the Invisible Church.The former has been corrupted(c);in the latter only do we find the true Bride of Christ.Men might belong to the visible Church and be dead in sin;they might be cut off from the visible Church and yet be true brothers of Christ(d).In spite of the treatment meted out to himself Origen magnifies the Christian ministry more than Clement;he seema to speak of it as a special "profession"(e).

His doctrine of clerical authority is not unlike that of Wiclif;priestly power depends upon priestly character(f).But he stresses the priestly office of every Christian,for in living Christ's life we share in His Priesthood(g).On this subject there is little if anything in common between Origen and his great contemporary,Cyprian;indeed it is safe to affirm that "with the prevailing tendency to hierarchical organization he had no sympathy"(h).

Origen was no sacramentarian.Baptism with water is merely a symbol of the soul's purification,but we must be dead to sin before,through baptism,we can be buried with Christ. Nor does his attitude towards the Eucharist align him with the High Churchmen."The bread is the word of righteoudness,but the wine is the word of the knowledge of Christ"(i).In addition Origen held that the offering made by Christ was His soul,not the

fleshly body,a view which automatically severs him from any such theory as transubstantiation.With him it was an axiom that "the letter killeth,it is the spirit that giveth life"(a).

In closing this brief review of Origen's theology mention should be made of his two principal works in Practical theology, the "Exhortation to Martyrs" and the "Treatise on Prayer".On this phase of his activity it must suffice to quote Cruttwell's estimate:"All critics have held his "Exhortation to Martyrs"and his "Treatise on Prayer" to be as pure examples of spiritual religion as are to be met with in the early Church"(b).

Origen's Influence.

If "By their fruits ye shall know them"be accepted as a standard of values then Origenism possesses a powerful vindication in the lives of those who professed it.Origen's own life is a striking example of the spiritual truths he emphasised,and the lives and labors of his disciples and admirers are fitting and additional tributes to spiritual religion.The history of the Alexandrian church leadership from the death of Demetrius to that of Didymus,and including the heroic Athanasius,is a record of men who found inspiration to goodness as well as greatness in Origen's writings,men who illustrated the type of character which he had declared the necessary equipment of God's priests. This can hardly be said of later outstanding orthodox Alexandrians,such as Theophilus and Cyril.

This is also true of the Constantipolitan episcopate.The greatest preachers ever heard in that imperial parish were Gregory and Chrysostom,to each of whom Origen's was a name in high honour. What Origen's pupils thought of him is seen in the "Oration and

Panegyric" addressed to Origen by his graduate scholar, Gregory, who later became the Wonder-Worker(a), while the devotion of his convert, Ambrosius, evidences the lasting power of Origen's spiritual magnetism. When we add to this concrete fruitage in consecrated lives his record as a peace-maker among the churches there is presented such a background for his teaching as is absolutely unique. And no fair judgement of Origen's work can be rendered unless this impressive testimony be given due weight.

For some time all Eastern theology was influenced by Origen, though in various degrees; the West also paid tribute to his thought, and "down to the end of the fourth century he retained upon the whole the high estimation to which his learning, piety, and sufferings entitled him"(b). His doctrines of Anthropology and Eternal Creation were attacked by Methodius, bishop of Olympus, who died a martyr in 311 A.D., and by Eustathius, but, on the other hand, he had eloquent defenders in Pamphilus(another martyr), and Eusebius of Caesarea. Athanasius had claimed his support for the doctrine of the Trinity; Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus composed the Philocalia, a selection from his works, and including much from his De Principiis, reputedly the most dangerous of his writings, while Gregory of Nyssa followed him in speculation. Hilary of Poitiers, Eusebius of Vercellae, and Ambrose translated into Latin certain of the Commentaries and Homilies. Even Jerome, in his earlier and better days, had the greatest admiration for one who was "teacher of the Church second only to the great Apostle"(c).

It was chiefly the fear of being considered heterodox that changed Jerome's attitude towards his one-time idol. The translation into Latin by Rufinus of Origen's De Principiis was the occasion for a right about face on the part of Jerome. With his

characteristic zeal and violence Jerome raised a storm which was only allayed by the condemnation of Origenism and the disgrace of Rufinus, at the hands of the Roman bishop, Anastasius. The competence of the bishop to act as judge may be questioned in the light of his own confession that, until the appearance of the De Principiis in Latin, he had never heard of Origen(a).

Jerome was learned saint but far from being a saintly scholar, and in this miserable quarrel with Rufinus and consedenunciation of Origen "he showed neither consistency nor generosity"(b). Nor was the condemnation by Theophilus of Alexandria on any higher plane; it was merely the mode whereby he was able to vent his spite on Chrysostom and thus send to his death one incomparably better than his own unscrupulous self. In neither case was there any real loyalty to Truth, rather, and only, loyalty to their own immediate interests.

This was the real start of the movement that finally relegated Origenism as a whole to the background of churchly theology. In 496 A.D. Pope Gelasius branded Origen as a schismatic, only permitting the use of such works as had the sanction of Jerome's translation, and in the next century, under the direction of the Emperor Justinian, the Fifth General Council(553 A.D.) included Origen's name among others anathematised as heretics. This anathema was re-affirmed, as it stood, by the First Lateran Council, in 696 A.D. It is certainly a bit of ironical history to find Justinian, who took as his royal consort a common-or uncomm - on-prostitute, playing defender of the faith against the saintliest of scholars, and this is an indication of the type of Christianity which condemned him. At the beck and call of imperial politicians and scoundrels in the east, in the west the church had

taken refuge under the wings of ecclesiastical authority;under such conditions the religious principles of the great Non-Conformist could not operate.More than that,through misunderstanding on the part of the ignorant masses and prejudiced classes who exaggerated his speculations and forgot his invaluable contributions "the name of Origen became a byword in the East"(a), while in the West books were written expressing the hope that he was among the Christ-redeemed!

Yet here and there down the ages there are glimpses of his spiritual visions.In the seventh century Maximus,the"divine philosopher" boldly advocated Origen's doctrines of grace and universal salvation,although coloured by the Neo-Platonism of the pseudo-Dionysius.But the age of independent thinking waned,and form and method occupied the attention of the Greek Church to the exclusion of anything original or inspiring.

In the West Tertullian and Auguatine had shaped the theological thought;Origenism was but little known there.In the Middle Ages John Scotus Erigena and the Neapolitan monk,Joachim,especially the former,reproduce several of Origen's ideals,e.g.the oneness of true philosophy and true religion,freewill,and the eternity of the world.In later times we find that Luther,enamoured as hw was by Augustine's teaching,denounces Origen in language which Augustine himself,who had respect for a great man with whom he differed greatly,had never used even of Pelagius.Melancthon also criticises Origen severely(b).

As might be expected Erasmus the scholar was a strong admirer of Origen."Besides writing his life this greatest of all Humanists traslated some of his Commentaries into Latin,thereby confirming his declaration that he "learned more Christian

philosophy from a single page of Origen than from ten of Augustine"(a).The Reformers were too generally biased in favor of the Augustinian theology to be able to see anything beyond the daring speculations of Origen.These were damnable heresies;they overlooked his inestimable service against Gnosticism,his unique position in the field of Biblical Criticism,and,strangest of all, his preparatory work which paved the way for the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity.

Nevertheless it must not be assumed that Origenism is now but a memory.To all thoughtful men his work marks him more as the religious genius than the ecclesiastical rebel,and the numerous editions and translations of his works since the Reformation is an evidence of this limited yet significant popularity(b).In the last century especially,while the term "Origenism" may be unheard,his emphasis on the Goodness of God,the Freedom of the Human Will,the Universality of salvation,and Biblical Criticism have in a vast number of Protestant churches all but supplanted the once all-dominant Augustinian-Calvinism.While the Creeds show but little change the thinking and preaching of today have,unconsciously and without thanks,adopted largely those very principles which form the real core of Origen's teaching.

It is indeed safe to believe that Origen would feel more at home in this age than he did in his own time.A large amount of the defect in the Alexandrian theology,including the lavish use of Allegory,arises from the futile effort to harmoniously unite tradition and science;today,with less reliance on tradition and with an almost infinitely more accurate and extensive scientific knowledge,would supply an environment eminently suitable for such religious thinkers as Clement and Origen.

The Christian School of Alexandria is then modern as well as ancient;in the Church's formative stage it played a leading part; perhaps its principles are destined to enter largely into the solution of our modern religious problems? It is therefore worthwhile to consider in brief,concise outline those religious fundamentals inherited from the Fathers of Alexandria.

First of all it represents Scientific Christianity. Science is the handmaid,not the antagonist of Religion.All True Knowledge is of God and leads to Him.In the application of this principle they often erred in favour of Philosophy,but,doubtless, their estimate of the comparative values of Revelation and Science is that presented by Origen in his Epistle to Gregory(a).In contrast with this attitude the contemporary West looked upon heathen learning with a scorn or suspicion that,in some quarters,still persists.

The Alexandrians recognised the need and value of Biblical Criticism.In this field Origen has no equal or competitor for centuries,and thus links himself,in spite of the limitations of his age,with all modern workers in similar research.In this branch of religious enterprise,apart from Jerome's revision work,the erudite West took little interest.

In Theology the difference between Alexandrian religious thought and Augustinianism was not so much a difference in logic as in emphases.In fact,when the two systems are compared,the Alexandrian logic,as represented by Origen,in its daring and wide sweep, is more impressive than Augustine's. But their premisses are different.The starting point of the one was the Goodness and Fatherhood of God,Who through Christ is immanent in humanity;to the other the Evil in Man and the power of the Evil One looms

up as the great problem.To the Alexandrian the Incarnation was the crowning event in the program of redemption;by Latins as the remedy for a catastrophe.

The Greek emphasised the spiritual Christ,the ever immanent Logos,who became man to exhibit the fulness of the Godhead bodily;the Latins magnified the historical Christ.Revelation to the Greek mind was a continuous process;God was forever revealing Himself through the human reason,itself an evidence of the immanent divine activity in man;revelation,however,had special epochs such as those of the Hebrew prophets and the Greek philosophers,which were perfected in the Incarnation.To the Latin Revelation was a "deposit"to be handed down,while human reason was considered untrustworthy and dangerous.

The Alexandrians emphasised the Freedom of the Human Will,by its exercise the spirits fell,by its power of choice and by the help of God men may recover their former estate;thus all are free to accept salvation.The Latins held that in Adam's fall humanity had been severed from God,its will for good lost; only those specially elected by God could return to Him,a doctrine of election which divides mankind in much the same way as Gnosticism had done.

On the place of the Church in the scheme of redemption Origen was a Protestant Low Churchman,while Augustine was an outstanding High Churchman ,whose churchly ideals and claims became the guiding policy in building up the Roman Catholic Hierarchy.The Alexandrians looked upon the sacraments as symbols of the great verities of Christian life;the Latins identified the symbols with the things signified,and transformed them into a priestly monopoly through which alone saving grace could be

imparted.To the Greek theologian the Church was indeed the agent of God in saving the world,but salvation is not limited to her communion.They did not dare to limit the Spirit's work by a fallible human organization,the invisible Church of the Spirit was the Ark of salvation.Latin theology exalted the visible church.Only within its communion and by aid of its ministry could salvation be obtained.All outside that magic pale,be they infants or wise sages, were inevitably lost.Thus God's elective power was limited to cooperation with a human hierarchy,the Holy Spirit did not even enjoy the privelege of a pass-key!It was and is a monstrous piece of human egotism,and all the more so in a church which professes to emphasise human sinfulness.By what hocus-pocus does the human bishop,some of them notable scoundrels,become an infallible judge?

Origen has been specially blamed for seeking the origin of evil in the Free Will of pre-existent souls rather than in the fall of Adam through the serpent tempter.But after all this was his Platonic mode of explaining the presence of evil,he pushes the the problem farther back,but is no nearer an explanation of the "Why" of the Fall than we are in the story of Eden.In that story the presence of the serpent tempter is left unexplained,but he has been highly useful ever since as an "excuse",as a "scape-goat". Origen refused to follow that line of evasion;man is wholly responsible;God is always Good.Origen's method of handling this whole question of Sin may seem fantastic,but his explanation of that,in addition to his view of general salvation ,including that of the Devil,should he so choose,establishes Origen as a more consistent Monist than the orthodox theory permits.For,after all, orthodox Christianity in its doctrine of God and the Devil is the Christianised version of Ormuzd and Ahriman;it is a dishonest

dualism;Monism is loudly asseverated,but persistently that profession is flatly contradicted by the insistence upon the presence and power of a Satanic Kingdom in open defiance of God,and,not without large success,seeking the ruin of mankind!And as long as that kingdom exists,whether free or bound,whether in Revelation fire or in Dante's ice-storage,God is not "All in All"!

Origen is sufficiently a Monist to see this contradiction;here his logic is superior to that of the West;his vision of the great consummation when "God shall be All in All"not only underlies and suggests the subordination of the Son,but also dictates his theory of a certain kind of Universalism.This has usually been denounced as his most noteworthy heresy,but critics have overlooked the logical conclusion of true Monism,as well as the fact that neither he nor Clement are thorough-going Universalists.If Origen had been such it would not likely have escaped notice by Augustine(a),who certainly had no reason to omit such a charge if he had found good grounds for it.The Alexandrian Universalism was not of the indiscriminate type;complete restoration of all to their original purity was not taught,their life of sin,and this especially so of great sinners,deprived them of much of their original capacity,hence their salvation could only develop to the measure of their remaining capacities.But that the saving Grace of God,in conjunction with the Will of the fallen creature,<u>could not</u> accomplish the redemption of any repentant created being,be he man or devil,the Alexandrians refused to believe.

Nor should it be overlooked that this belief in a final restoration of all was not confined to Clement and Origen.The thought contained in Tennyson's verse,so familiar to moderns,

"One God,one law,one element,
And one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves".

appealed as strongly to later theologians of stainless orthodoxy.Gregory Nazianzen regarded it as an open question;Gregory of Nyssa proclaims it more emphatically and absolutely than the Alexandrines(a).

The Alexandrine idea of salvation was that of restoration. The Prodigal Son returned hungry and in rags,but his father had never disowned him.So the resurrection body,according to the Alexandrine concept,so unpalatable to realistic orthodoxy,was but a logical step upward to the original form of existence.Here Alexandria follows the Pauline thought,which is just as opposed to the resumption of our identical earthly bodies as any Greek philosopher could be.

Spirituality was the keynote of the Alexandrine theology. The inner,personal,spirit life of the Christian was incomparably more important than scrupulous obedience to churchly rule and slavish dependence upon her symbolic ministry.The spiritual ideals of John's Gospel were the ideals of the Alexandrians;the West preferred the Synoptic tradition.This devotion to spirituality underlies much of the Alexandrine allegorism,and,in so far,is their unceasing protest against the worship of the letter.

Origen's speculative flights have been given too much attention and criticism.Yet they were conducted in reverence and humility,they are courageous without being dogmatic.He had the faith of Whittier that he could never lose touch with the Divine:

"I know not where His islands lift
Their fronded palms in air;
I only know I cannot drift
Beyond His love and care".

List of Origen's Writings.

Those underscored are extant in whole or in part.

Period I, Before removal from Alexandria.

The Commencement of The Hexapla.

First Commentary on the Canticles. Perhaps not published.

A.D.228-231.

Commentaries on The Gospel of John(Bks I-5).

Commentaries on Psalms, I-25; On Genesis(Bks. I-8); on Lamentations and Exodus(Bks. I-2). Mescellanies(10 Bks).

De Principiis(4 Bks).

On Prayer; On The Resurrection(2 Bks); On Free Will. The dates of these are doubtful, and may belong to the Second Period.

Period 2. After withdrawal to Caesarea. (231-249)

Commentaries on I Cor. and St Luke; Homilies on Deut. and St Luke.

232-238, Commentaries on St John, Second Series.

235-236. Letter to Gregory; Commentary on Genesis(Bks 9-12);

Mystical Homilies on Genesis.

236. Exhortation to Martyrs. Homilies on Judges and Isaiah.

Commentaries on Isaiah(30 Bks).

238-240. Commentaries on Ezekiel(25 Bks).

Letter to Julius Africanus.

Commentaries on The Canticles, five Bks written in Athens, the remaining five at Caesarea.

241. Homilies on Psalms 36-38. Completion of Commentaries on Psalms. Commentaries and Notes on Exodus and Leviticus; on Isaiah and Minor Prophets; Notes on Numbers;

Homilies on O.T. Historical Books.

244- Homilies from extempore addresses on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Joshua, and Judges.; Jeremiah & Ezekiel.

List of Origen's Writings.

244- Commentaries on Romans(I5 Bks).

The Complete Hexapla ?

Commentaries on I Thess, and possibly on Galatians and the other Pauline Epistles, including Hebrews.

Letters to Fabianus and others.

There were one hundred in the time of Eusebius.

249. Contra Celsum (8 Bks).

The Philocalia,

a book of extracts from Origen's works, and written by Basil and Gregory Nazianzen about the year 358 A.D.

Notes and References on Chapter 4.

Page I.

(a) Fairweather,"Origen",p.35.
Allen,"The Continuity of Christian Thought",p.70.
(b) Stevenson,"The History of Christianity",vol.I,p.3I9.
(c) Bigg,"The Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.II6.
(d) Eusebius,H.E.6.I9.

Page 2.

(a) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.225.
(b) Fairweather,"Origen", p.39.

Page 3.

(a) Fairweather,"Origen",p.4I.
(b) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.225.

Page 4.

(a) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.226.
(b) Fairweather,"Origen",p.4I.
(c) Moore,"History of Religions",vol.2,p.I70.
Inge,"Ency.of Ethics and Religion",Art."Alex.Theology".
Fairweather,"Origen",p.44.

Page 5.

(a) "ap Euseb.H.E". 6.I9.
(b) Bigg,"Origins of Christianity",p.4I8(note)
"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.II9.(note).
(c) Cruttwell,'Lit.Hist.of Early Christianity",vol.2,p468.
(d) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.226.

Page 6.

(a) Origen,"De Principiis", I.5.
(b) Fairweather,"Origen",p.47.
(c) Euseb."H.E". b.6,c.I9.

Page 7.

(a) Fairweather,"Origen",p.47.
(b) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,pp.226-227.
(c) Ibid,p.227.
(d) Euseb."H.E",,b.6,c.2I.
(e) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p227.

Page 8.

(a) Fairweather,"Origen",p.5I.
Vaughan,"Essays and Remains",i.p.I7.

Page 9.

(a) Stephenson,"The Hist.of Christianity" vol.I,p.32I.
(b) Eusebius,"H.E". b.6,cc.22 &"33.
(c) Harnack,Art.in Ency.Brit.on"Origen".

Page I0.

(a) Fairweather,"Origen",p.59.
(b) Eusebius,"H.E.",6.33.
(c) Jerome,"Catal". c.60.

Page II.

(a) Fairweather,"Origen",pp.6I-62.
(b) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.229.
(c) Schaff,"History of The Christian Church",vol.2,p.789.

Page I3.

(a) Fairweather,"Origen",p.35
(b) Allen,"The Continuity of Christian Thought",p.7I.
(c) Schaff,"History of The Christian Church",vol.2,p.779.
(d) Harnack,"History of Dogma",vol.2,p.I77.
(e) Epiphanius,"Haeres".,64.63.

Page I4.

(a) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.229.
(b) Fairweather,"Origen",p.98.
(c) Westcott and Hort,"Greek New Testamant",(I895),Introd.
(d) Ibid.
(e) Fairweather,"Origen",p.I05.
(f) Origen,"Com.in Matt",I5-I4. also ,
Moffatt,"Introd.to Lit.of N.T.",p.52(foot-note).

Page I5.

(a) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.I24(note)
(b) Griesbach,"Opuscula Academica",vol.I,p.240.
(c) Cruttwell,"Lit.Hist.of Early Christianity",vol.2,p.483.
(d) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.I24.

Page I6.

(a) Harnack,Art."Origen",Ency.Britt.
(b) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.230.
(c) Justin,"Dial.with Trypho",chaps 7I-73.
(d) Fairweather,"Origen",p.I00.
(e) Ibid.

Page I7.

(a) Fairweather,"Origen",pp.I00-I0I.
(b) Irenaeus,"Haer".3.23.
(c) Foakes-Jackson,"The Hist.of The Christian Church",p.276.

Page I8.

(a) Fairweather,"Origen",p.I02.
(b) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.230.
(c) Ibid.
(d) Ibid.
(e) Foakes-Jackson,"The Hist.of The Christian Church",p.
276.
(f) Guericke,"Church History"(Ancient),p.234(footnote).
(g) De Wette,"Introduction to The Old Testament".
(h) Jerome,"Praef.in Paralip".

Page I9.

(a) Fairweather,"Origen",p.I20.
(b) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,"Prologue of Rufinus",p.237.

Notes and References on Chapter 4(Cont.).

Page 20.

(a) Fairweather,"Origen",p.I2I.
(b) Origen,"In Joan". Bk.I.3.
(c) Ibid. Bk.I.6.
(d) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.9,p.294.
(e) Fairweather,"Origen",pp.I22-I23.
(f) Eusebius,"H.E.",6.36.
(g) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.9,p.5I2.

Page 2I.

(a) Figgs,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",pp.I3I-I32.
(b) Origen,"In Joan". Bk.5.24.
(c) Ibid I3.39.
(d) Ibid I0.2-3-4.
(e) Foakes-Jackson,"History of The Christian Church", p.273.

Page 22.

(a) Origen,"In Joan", Bk.I,5-6.
(b) Origen,"De Principiis",Bk.4.I.
(c) Rainy,"The Ancient Catholic Church",p.I70.
(d) Origen,"De Principiis", Bk.4,I3.
(e) Origen,"De Principiis",Bk.4,II.
(f) Origen,"De Principiis",Bk.4.20.

Page 23.

(a) Philo,"Quod Deus Immutabilis",5sqq.
(b) Origen,"De Principiis",Bk.4.I6.I7.I8.
(c) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.I38.

Page 24.

(a) Fairweather,"Origen",p.66.
(b) Eusebius,"H.E.",6.25.
(c) Origen,"De Principiis",Bk.2,6 (Wisdom of Soloman).
(d) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.386.
(e) Fairweather,"Origen",p.67.
(f) Origen,"Contra Celsum",chap.63.","De Prin",Bk.2.3.6.& "De Prin". Bk.I.3.3.
(g) Moffatt,"Introd.to The literature of The New Testament", pp.372,479,467-468.
(h) Fairweather,"Origen",p.67.

Page 25.

(a) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.23I.
(b) Foakes-Jackson,"History of The Christian Church",p.I98.
(c) Origen,"Pref.Contra Celsum".
(d) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.23I.
(e) Foakes-Jackson,"History of The Christian Church",p.I98.
(f) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.234.

Notes and References on Chapter 4(Cont).

Page 26.

(a)Origen,"Contra Celsum",I.8.
(b) Fisher,"Hist.of Christian Doct", p.40.
(c) Fairweather,"Origen",p.I06.
(d) Origen,"Contra Celsum", Bk.I.I.
(e) Fairweather,"Origen",p.I06;"Contra Cels". Bk.5.59.
(f) Origen,"Contra Celsum",3.9;4.32;7.26.
(g) Ibid. Bk.8.
(h) Fairweather,"Origen",p.III.
(i) Fisher,"Hist.of Christian Doct". p.40.

Page 27. (a) Fairweather,"Origen",p.I25.

Page 28.

(a) Origen,"Pref.De Prin".
(b) Fisher,"Hist.of Christian Doctrine",p.I05.
(c) Allen,"The Continuity of Christian Thought",p.7I.
(d) Ibid. pp.7I-72.

Page 29.

(a) Stephenson,"The Hist.of Christianity",vol.I.p.322.
(b) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.I57.
(c) Origen,"De Principiis",Bk.I.Isaq.
(d) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.I56.
Irenaeus,"Apol". 5.5.I;Tertullian"Adv.Prax".,7.
(e) Origen,"De Principiis",2.5.
(f) Origen,"In Ezek",Homilies,6.6.

Page 30.

(a) Origen,"De Principiis", 2.9.I.
(b) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.I59(note).
(c) Origen,"De Principiis",I.2.I0.
Fisher,"Hist.of Christian Doct".p.I06.
(d) Ibid. p.I07.
(e) Lucretius,5.I65.
(f) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.I60(note).
(g) Origen,"De Principiis", Bk.3.5.3.
(h) Origen,"In Joann".I3.42.

Page 3I.

(a) Hatch,"The Hibbert Lectures"(I888),pp.I2I-I22.
(b) Eusebius,"H.E". 6.I4.I0.
(c) Foakes-Jackson,"History of The Christian Church",p.I64.
(d) Tertullian,"Adv. Prax".c.3;Origen"In Joann",2.2.
(e) Bigg,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.I66.
(f) Origen,"De Principiis",Bk.I,c.2.7-8.

Page 32.

(a) Origen,"De Principiis",Bk.I,2.2.
(b)Origen,"In Joann".2.2.
(c) Origen,"Contra Celsum",5.39.
(d) Origen,"De Principiis", Bk.I,2.6.
(e) Origen,"Hebrews I.3.
(f) Origen,"De Principiis",4.28.
(g) Foakes-Jackson,"Hist.of The Christian Church",p.I63.
(h) Fairweather,"Origen",p.I54.

Page 33.

(a) Foakes-Jackson,"Hist.of The Christian Church"p.I62.
(b) Origen,"In Joann". I.22.
(c) Biggs,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria", p.I69.
Origen,"In Joann". I.30.

Page 34.

(a) Biggs,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",P.I89.
(b) Origen,"De Principiis", Bk.2.6.3.
(c) Origen,"In Joann".20.I7;"Con.Cels".I.32.33.
(d) Origen,"Contra Celsum", 4.I5,7.I6.
(e) Origen,"In Levit". Hom.I2.4.
(f) Origen,"Contra Celsum", 3.23;4.I9.
(g) Origen,"De Principiis", 4.I6.
(h) Origen,"Contra Celsum", 6.75.
(i) Ibid. - - - - - - - -2.64.
(j) Biggs,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria", p.I9I.
(k) Origen,"In Joann". 6.37.
(l) Biggs,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria", p.I92.

Page 35.

(a) Origen,"De Principiis",Pref.
(b) Origen,"De Principiis",Bk.3.3.
(c) Ibid. ----------Bk.3.2.
(d) Ibid. * * * * * * * Bk.3.4
(e) Ibid.
(f) Ibid.
(g) Origen,"In Joann". 6.I7.
(h) Origen,"De Principiis",I.3.3; 4.30.
(i) Origen,"De Principiis",I.3.2.
(j) Biggs,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.I74.
(k) Fairweweather,"Origen", p.I58.
(l) Origen,"De Principiis", Bk.2,7.I.
(m) Origen,John 2-6.
(n) Fairweather,"Origen", p.I57.

Page 36.

(a) Harnack,"Hist.of Dogma",p.I59.
(b) Gregory,"Orat".35.29.30.
(c) Rainy,"The Ancient Catholic Church", p.I73.
(d) Origen,"De Principiis", Bk.2,9.Iff.

Page 37.

(a) Origen,"De Prin".2.1.2; 3.I.2f.
(b) Ibid. 2.9.6f.
(c) Ibid. 3.5.34.
(d) Ibid. I.8.3.
(e) Ibid. 3.6.2.
(f) Ignatius,"Ad Smyrn".6.
(g) Origen,"In Lev",Hom.I.3(Col.I-20).
(h) Origen,"In Rom". 5.9.
(i) Origen,"De Principiis", 3.[illegible].

Page 38.

(a) Origen,"In Rom". 5.6.
(b) Fairweather,"Origen",p.I86.
(c) Origen,"In Rom". 4.II.
(d) Origen,"In Matt". I6.8.
(e) Origen,"In Rom". 3.8;3.25;4.8.
(f) Harnack,"Hist.of Dogma",p.I62.
(g) Origen,"De Principiis", 3.I.I4.
(h) Jerome,"Letter to Avitus".
(i) Fairweather,"Origen",p.I90.
(j) Origen,"De Principiis" Preface.
(k) Rainy,"The Ancient Catholic Church",p.I78.

Page 39.

(a) Origen,De Principiis", 2.9.Iff.
(b) Origen,"De Principiis", I.6.4; 2.I.3.
(c) Origen,"De Orincipiis",2.IO;3.6;Contra Cel.5.22.
(d) Origen,"De Principiis", 2.II.2.
(e) Fisher,"History of Christian Doctrine",p.II2.

Page 40.

(a) Cruttwell,"Lit.Hist.of Early Christianity",vol.2.p.503.
(b) Origen,"In Matt". I2.II.
(c).Origen,"In Jer",Hom.4.3.
(d) Biggs,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.222.
(e) Origen,"In Num". Hom.2.I;"In Jesu Nave",Hom.I7.2.
(f) Origen,"In Lev",Hom.5.3.
(g) Origen,"In Lev", Hom.4.6;6.5.
(h) Cruttwell,"Lit Hist of Early Christianity",vol.2.p.503.
(i) Origen,"In Matt",Com.Series 85.

Page 4I.

(a) Origen,"In Lev". Hom.5.3.
(b) Cruttwell,"Lit.Hist.of Early Christianity",vol.2.p.503.

Page 42.

(a) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.6,p.2I.
((b) Biggs,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.273.
(c) Jerome,Pref.to Trans.of Hom.on Ezekiel.

Page 43.

(a) Biggs,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.275(note).
(b) Foakes-Jackson,"Hist.of The Christian Church",p.489.

Page 44.

(a) Biggs,"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",p.277.
(b) Ibid. p.279 (note).

Page 45

(a) Fairweather,"Origen", p.259.
(b) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.232.

Page 46.(a) Ante-Nicene Fathers,vol.4,p.393.

Page 49.(a) Augustine,"De civitate Dei", 2I.I7.

Page 50.(a) Gregory of Nyssa,"Orat".in I Cor.I5.28.

Alexandria's Indirect Influence Upon Christianity.

Chapter 5,- An Appendix.

Chapter 5,-An Appendix.

Alexandria's Indirect Influence Upon Christianity.

Not the least interesting of the developments in Alexandrian religious mentality are those which by way of competition and antagonism helped both to modify and solidify Early Christianity.From without and within such influences were at work,and a glimpse at four of these,more in the nature of a reminder than a discussion,should assist in demonstrating the tremendously important part played by Alexandria in the development of Christian doctrine and worship.

Isis-Serapis Mystery Cult.

This was a religious syncretism born of Ptolemaic politics;an artistic union of Egyptian and Greek religious mysteries skilfully worked out by Manetho and Timotheus.The kingly purpose was to present to his Greek and Egyptian subjects a religion in which each could recognise his own favourite deity,and the syncretising trend of the time and the obvious resemblances between the religious legends of the two countries rendered the task so much the easier.

In Serapis the Egyptian could honour his own powerful deities,Osiris and Apis,and in the tragedies and final triumph of Osiris the Greek could vision the similar history of Dionysios, while in the sorrowful sufferings of Isis he recognised those of the gracious Demeter.Horus,third member of this new Trinity,plays the part of son,and in his mysterious birth corresponds,point for point,with that of Iacchos.

The important point to note is that those deities were saviours through suffering;they had reached their power by the way of painful tragedy;their divinity was sympathetically human.

With this magnetic nucleus for the spiritually hungry this Cult specialised in ornate ritual,magic rites,and a highly organized priesthood,carefully graded and tonsured as a sign of their dedication to their religion.Thus equipped with Egyptian wisdom and Greek art,Isis-Serapis developed a marvellous missionary vogue.Welcomed in the East it throve on persecution in the West, until it won a leading place among the empire's religious competitors.It even found favour with emperors such as Domitian and Caligula,while Commodus took part in its public processions.

It thus preceded Christianity all over the empire,and this Alexandrian religious syncretism ,with its Lord and Queen of Heaven,its emphasis upon hierarchical powers,magic rites,and imposing services,presented itself as a powerful antagonist to the new Faith for several centuries.And the contest did not result in such a complete victory for Christianity as many suppose. While stridently denouncing the practices and beliefs of such antagonists Christianity absorbed as well as destroyed.

A devotee of Isis-Serapis would not feel so out of place in a Church where the Queen of Heaven has merely changed her name,where tonsured priests perform magic rites before gorgeous altars,and where Lenten's ascetic sadness followed by Easter's effervescent gladness would vividly recall the old-time celebration of the Passion and Resurrection of Osiris. What Hatch affirms as to the influence of the Greek Mysteries on Christian ritual and procedure(a) in regard to the heathenization of Baptism and the Eucharist can be affirmed also of the Alexandrian Mystery Cult. Hierarchical,ritualistic,magical Christianity does not root itself in the New Testament;these emphases are foreign in origin;and probably Alexandria furnished a fair quota.

Isis-Serapis. Bibliography.

Cumont F.-"Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism" pp.73-102.
Groton W F."The Eucharist" pp.176-197.
Legge F. "Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity", vol.I, ch.2.
Frazer J G."The Golden Bough-Adonis, Attis, Osiris" pp.269-367.
Dill S."Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius", pp.560-584.
Bigg C. "The Church's Task under the Roman Empire", pp.39-46.
Carpenter J E."Phases of Early Christianity", pp.218-226.
Case S J."Evolution of Early Christianity", pp.315-323.
Jones M. "The New Testament in The 20th Century", pp.126-127.
Wenley R M. "Modern Thought and The Crisis in Belief", pp.175-189.
Moore C H. "Religious Thought of The Greeks", pp.262, 269-276.
Glover T R. "The Conflict of Religions in The Early Roman Empire", pp.22-25, 98-100, 106-112, 233-237.
Clemen C. "Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources", pp.230-266.
Angus S."The Environment of Early Christianity", pp.89-93.
"The Mystery Religions and Christianity"
Walker W. "A History of The Christian Church", pp.10, 96.
Kennedy H A A."St Paul and the Mystery Religions", pp.99-103.
Bissing F W. "Cult of Isis in Pompeian Paintings".
Budge E A T W."Osiris and The Egyptian Resurrection" (2 vols).
Cheatham S. "The Mysteries, Pagan and Christian".
Harnack A. "Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries".
Lang A. "Myth, Ritual and Religion".
Milne J.G. "Graeco-Egyptian Religion" (In Hastings' E.R.E.).
Scott-Moncrieff P.D. "Paganism and Christianity in Egypt".
Whittaker T. "The Origins of Christianity".

Gnosticism.

"Gnosticism may be described as an eclectic philosophy in which heathen, Jewish, and Christian elements are commingled in various proportions, giving rise to a diversity of systems; the ideas of these systems being incorporated in mythical or mythological forms" (a). It was a bold attempt on the part of a certain type of Christian converts to construct their new religion in harmony with their old philosophical concepts of Good and Evil, with the result that their Christianity was denuded of its real, distinctive features as taught in the New Testament, fatalism and phantasm being substituted therefor.

Syncretism was the popular note then-as now-, and the Gnostic endeavoured to manipulate Christianity much as Philo had treated Judaism, with the same result in both efforts-repudiation. The beginnings of Christianity were singularly favourable for such a development; the era of organization of doctrine and practice still lay in the future. Thus the field for heady thinkers and eccentric faddists lay open for such adventurers as Simon Magus, Cerinthus and their like. Thus we find in the New Testament writings pointed indications of this sort of invasion (b), and the descriptions there given tally so closely with later pictures of Gnostic professors that it is assumed that Gnosticism took its rise with that of Christianity itself (c).

The second century brought this movement to a head in various schools of this type of thought, which may be classified under two main divisions, Syrian and Alexandrine, with Marcion in an independent class by himself. It is with the Alexandrine wing that this sketch has to deal, and as this particular school ranks the highest in ability its study will sufficiently show

the trend and dangerous nature of this primitive heresy.Of this school the best known leaders are Basilides and Valentinus,and while contemporaries,of the same school,there is considerable difference between their systems.Herein lay a great weakness in Gnosticism,there was no general agreement,it was an intellectual riot.

However,although divergent in development,all Gnostics agree on certain fundamentals.This world of Matter is evil,positively or negatively,its Creator,the Demiurge,is either evil or ignorant,at best his work is imperfect.He too is the God of the Old Testament,its teachings and history represent his imperfect or evil ideals.Thus the Gnostic disposed of the Old Testament;apart from some prophetic gleams,it must be rejected as authority for the Christian.They considered it too hopelessly Demiurgic even for the allegorical crucible. They cut that Gordian knot.

God,the Supreme Being,is the Ineffable;Basilides calls Him the Non-Existent;He is revealed by way of Emanations,Aeons, a bewildering and fantastic hypostatism of Platonic abstractions. The Fall of one of these,Sophia,initiates that lower creation of which the Demiurge and Man are both actors and victims.Mankind is simply sparks of this Sophia entangled in evil Matter,yet not equally endowed with the higher element.So they are divided,not by choice but by their lot,into three classes,pneumatic,psychic, and hylic.Naturally the Gnostic claimed to belong to and represent the highest,the pneumatic!

The Gnostic emphasised salvation by Christ.But their Christ was not God,He was only the greatest Aeon.Nor in His revelation did He become truly Man.Only in appearance-docetism. The

Gnostic theory of Matter made it impossible for Him to assume a true body.But salvation could only be appropriated by certain human types,the pneumatic fully,the psychic partially,the hylic not at all!Here we have predestination as the Gnostic interpreted St Paul,its basis is different from that of Augustine but the results are similar.

It should be said here,however,that Basilides,as reported by Hippolytus and Clement of Alexandria(a) presents a totally different scheme.With him God is the Creator,creation being initiated in the form of a world-seed.After this evolution takes charge,each of the seed elements develops and rises into its own proper sphere.But he too has a place for Christ's work,for although the pneumatic and psychic men ascend,by way of their development,to higher spheres,the hylic remain here until freed by special intervention.Finally when all have found their proper places a great ignorance is poured out so that no element may be tempted to aspire beyond its own sphere.

Thus the Christian Gnostic saved his Oriental Dualism and human philosophy at the expense of his Christianity.And the danger to the Church in this teaching lay in the fact that he professed to arrive at these conclusions by way of his higher knowledge of the Scriptures.In Marcion we see the most thorough-going treatment of these by way of elimination,but the Alexandrines through the alchemy of allegory found in the New Testament a basis for their theories,John's Gospel and Paul's writings,in particular,being their favoured authorities.That they wielded a large influence and constituted a real menace to Christianity may be seen from the attention given them by such Fathers as Irenaeus, Hippolytus,Tertullian,Clement and Origen.

If then Gnosticism be "in the first place,intellectualism,one-sided over-valuation of knowledge at the expense of moral activity(a),it probably made small appeal to the average Christian;it was rather an attempt to capture the Church's intellectual leadership.As such it was a distinct challenge to opponents to organize and formulate. The Gnostic assumption that Matter is evil and the consequent denial of its creation by God,the elimination of the Old Testament as an authority,their free treatment of the New Testament and appeals to pseudo-Gospels,the denial of Christ's essential Divinity and humanity,and their deterministic fatalism, all demanded a positive,constructive answer as well as emphatic denial and denunciation.

Blessings are said to sometimes come in disguise and if the doctrines of Churchly authority,systematic theology,biblical criticism and scriptural exegesis be considered such,then to the Gnostics much of the credit for these developments must be given.

Bibliography.

Clement of Alexandria's "Excerpta ex Theodoto"and elsewhere. Origen's "In Joann",Irenaeus "Heresies",Hippolytus "Philosophoumena", Tertullian "Adv. Valentin.","Adv.Marcion.",Epiphanius "Praescreptiones.",Ptolemy's"Epistle to Flora",Plotinus "Ennead"2.9, Schaff "History of The Christian Church"vol.2,pp.442-498. Mainy "The Ancient Catholic Church"chap 6. Fisher "History of Christian Doctrine"pp.51-60."History of The Christian Church"p.75. Foakes-Jacjson "History of The Christian Church"pp.122-149. Bigg "Christian Platonists of Alexandria" pp.27-55. Neander"Church History"vol.2. Mansel "Gnostic Heresies".Renan "Marc Aurele". Dobschutz "Life in The Primitive Church". Baur "Church History" vol.2. King "Gnostics and Their Remains".Bethune-Baker "Early History of Christian Doctrine".Lightfoot "The Col.Heresy" (From Com.on Col.and Phil.).

Neo-Platonism.

Neo-Platonism "was a pantheistic eclecticism and a philosophico-religious syncretism,which sought to reconcile Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy with Oriental religion and theosophy,polytheism with monotheism,superstition with culture,and to hold the old popular religion in a more refined and idealized grasp"(a). "Philo was a forerunner of this school,Ammonius its reputed founder;but it was Plotinus who gave it systematic form"(b).

Neo-Platonism was the crystallization of that philosophic reaction against scepticism which shows itself much earlier in the writings of such men as Plutarch,Celsus,and Numenius of Apamea, but its definite presentation as a religion for the intelligentsia may be dated from the later years of Plotinus(died 269 A.D), who made Rome his teaching headquarters for more than twenty years, and whose religious philosophy is presented to us in the six books of the Enneads,written by his pupil and successor,Porphyry.

Plotinus was not a native Alexandrian nor did he ever teach in that city,but from the fact that he spent eleven years there in the school of Ammonius Saccas,who,as far as is known, was the only teacher thus honoured,it may be safely assumed that it was there he received those ideals which he afterwards so successfully popularized among the Roman elite. On this ground Alexandria may justly claim to be the cradle of Neo-Platonism.

Unlike the Gnostics Plotinus and his successors made no attempt to amalgamate with Christianity;to them the Christian mode of salvation appeared "vulgar",a misrepresentation of the attitude of God towards the human race.But Christianity's claim that Jesus was the Only Saviour was especially obnoxious to the Neo-Platonic syncretism.They were willing to grant Him a place

in their religious Pantheon,but He was no better,if equal to,such heroes as Pythagoras,Plato,and Apollonius of Tyana. In fact their religious philosophy has no place for a Saviour who reveals Divinity suffering through His love for humanity;the glorified ascetic,Apollonius of Tyana,was their idea of what Jesus should have been and done.

Such a radical disagreement was bound to produce a bitter antagonism;Porphyry launched a violent and not unskilful attack against this presumptuous rival,in which discussion,it may be noted,his analysis of the Book of Daniel is critically more feasible than that of many Christian commentators,and in the cruel persecution of Christians under Diocletian a Neo-Platonic inspiration is more than suspected(a).The reign of Julian(361-363) furnished the last opportunity for a demonstration of the values of Neo-Platonism to the disciples of Plotinus,Porphyry,and Jamblichus.That they failed him in his strenuous effort is a matter of history;theoretical philosophy was no match for an enthusiastic religion. It only remained for Proclus,its great schoolman,to give the system that form in which it was transferred to Christianity and Mohammedanism in the Middle Ages.The closing of the school at Athens by Justinian was neither heroic nor necessary; Neo-Platonism,as a religion,had already been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

Dean Inge asserts that Neo-Platonism's greatest contribution to Christianity was its emphasis upon "God is a Spirit"(b). This may be true,yet the God of Neo-Platonism is too abstract and detached a Being to be attractive to the average man.While the connection between the One and this world is presented in a trinitarian form the whole process is more suggestive of an

impersonal, involuntary mechanism than of control by a Father-God. The Neo-Platonic view of sin is weak, man can, by way of self-imposed discipline, free himself from this negative handicap, he can even climb higher than his source, the World-Soul, and in the Absolute One find an unthinking Nirvana! The whole conception is but a dazzling dream constructed of unlimited presumption!

And this was only for the favoured few; the masses were allowed to satisfy their religious aspirations in magic, idol worship, and polytheism in general.

But the Neo-Platonic ideal of retirement from the world and holiness through asceticism found an abundant expression in Christian monasticism, while its salvation through works and its tolerance of magic helped to develop the importance of Christian rites and relic worship. Augustine's appreciation of Neo-Platonism, in the seventh book of his Confessions, was a strong recommendation, the writings of pseudo-Dionysius gave it a semi-apostolic standing, the Jewish Cabala, John Scotus Erigena, Bonaventura represent its influence in the Middle Ages, while the Cambridge Platonists of yesterday testify to its modern appeal.

Bibliography.

Foakes-Jackson-History of The Christian Church" pp.195-203. Rainy-Ancient Catholic Church, ch.9. Fisher-Hist.of Christian Doct.pp 173,204,230. Schaff-Hist of Christian Church, p95ff. Inge-Art. Neo-Platonism, in Ency.of Rel. and Ethics. Dill-Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius. Bigg-Christian Platonists of Alexandria, Lect 7. Erdmann-Hist.of Philosophy, vol.I. Uberweg-Hist.of Philosophy. Lecky-Hist.of European Morals, vol.I. The Enneads (Eng Trans).

Arianism.

The first Ecumenical Council, that of Nicaea, was called into being by Constantine, principally for the purpose of settling a dispute in theology between Alexander, bishop of Alexandria and his presbyter, Arius. The latter, however, was not a product of the Alexandrian school of theology; as a pupil of Lucian of Antioch he was an intruder. It is in Athanasius, whose name is a synonym for orthodoxy, that the voice of Alexandria is heard.

The Greek world of that period was addicted-or afflicted-to the science of "definition". To define the mysterious, the undefinable, became its intellectual recreation. And religion, rooted in the Ultimate Mystery, was not exempted from the operations of this egotistical impertinence. On the contrary, it was made the popular playground of religious philosophers and cock-sure metaphysicians. Where angels fear to tread man strutted, and thus in the course of a few centuries Divine Revelation and Salvation were securely "cabbined and cribbed" in the imposing temple-some might irreverently characterise it as "mausoleum"-of Dogmatic Theology! And the Arian controversy was the first decided development towards that consummation.

There is of course a place and necessity for definite opinions or beliefs in the realm of religion, and it is natural that those of similar beliefs should unite in the defence and propagation of their common convictions, but for human Councils or Popes to issue doctrinal definitions of eternal mysteries as authoritative tests, infallible pronouncements, final judgements, to be enforced by anathemas, excommunication, and death, reveals a weird blindness to human limitations, as well as an equally strange forGetfulness of the Pauline humility as expressed in the words

"here we see through a glass,darkly",and "here we know in part".

As a product of that age Arianism raised a real issue,once enunciated it had to be met.Professing to be a defender of pure monotheism as against Sabellianism Arius' scheme was a return to polytheism;it robbed Christ of both divinity and eternity,He was created to create,therefore the first of creatures,the highest demi-god,but apart from God.He had achieved the right to be called God,but as an honour,not from His nature.

Except in the idea of subordination there is nothing in common between Arianism and Origenism. "There was never a time when the Son was not" is Origen's flat contradiction of the Arian "there was when He was not".As we have seen Origen's theory of the subordination was that of function,not in His nature,while the Arian Christ has no essential relation to the Godhead,He is but a creature,a glorified Demiurge!On the contrary Athanasius utilised Origen's "eternal generation" of the Son as the basis for the Son's eternal equality with the Father.

Of equal interest in the study of Arianism is the fact that our introduction to the era of creed-making is also an introduction to the period of Imperial domination in the Church. It is surely a tragic coincidence that at the very time the Church made her first united declaration on behalf of the full Divinity of Christ she was handing over her spiritual independence into the hands of Caesar,only nominally a Christian! And all because he wore the purple and a friendly smile! And what Constantine received as a gift his less worthy successors claimed as their right!

That those church fathers,many of whom bore the scars of the Diocletian persecution,should have thus failed to assert the Church's rights,at the first friendly wave of the imperial hand

may in charity be credited to the general governmental notions then in the ascendant,but that they should allow,even encourage , the emperor to act as arbiter in decisions regarding articles of faith exhibits such a lack of common sense and ordinary consistency as to render ridiculous those high-sounding claims of Divine guidance in those early Councils so relished by High Church historians.The picture of Eusebius of Caesarea,the most learned churchman at Nicaea,solving his doubts as to the meaning of the key word "homoousios"by consulting the unlearned and unbaptized Constantine (a) eloquently evidences this new obsequiousness in the presence of royalty.

The evils of this church and state combination is too well illustrated in the history of the Arian controversy subsequent to Nicaea,and extending over fifty years,to need more than passing mention.Between the Councils of Nicaea and Constantinople(325-381) numerous churchly councils met only to illustrate the church's lack of unanimity and its truckling subserviency to the religious whims of emperors,whose scholarship or Christian character are generally conspicuous by their absence.Indeed the only learned and sincerely religious ruler of the period mentioned above may be said to have been Julian!

It was not an heroic age in church history;neither Orthodox nor Arian,in general,present a fearless front in behalf of strong convictions.There are a few noble exceptions.Athanasius is the outstanding hero who refused to bow the knee to the imperial Baal,also Julius ,bishop of Rome,Hilary of Poictiers,and the three great Cappodocians are worthy leaders of a great cause.

The part played by the Alexandrian Church in this testing time is especially honorable.She never swerved in

enthusiastic fidelity to Athanasius,whether in exile or in immediate charge,and to this loyalty on the part of one of the leading dioceses in the whole church much credit must be given for the final triumph of orthodoxy.In Origen and Athanasius Alexandria contributed to the Church not only two leading theologians but also two of the most consecrated Christians in all Church History.

With the accession of the orthodox Theodosius Arians lost the imperial favour in which they had largely put their trust, and soon ceased to exert any theological influence.It is,however, in their missionary labours that their noblest record is found. Through the labours of Ulphilas and others many of the Gothic tribes accepted Arian Christianity,and thus Alaric,conqueror of Rome in 410 A.D.,was,fortunately for the Roman Christians,not a heathen but a Christian.And Arian Christianity made it easy,later, for those Goths to accept the orthodox beliefs.

In post-Reformation times Arianism has played no great part.Socinianism carries in it some Arian teachings,in England there were some Arian developments in the 17th and 18th centuries,while the New England Unitarians may be said to represent the logical downward trend of Arian Christology.

Bibliography.

Nichols,The Growth of The Christian Church,vol.I,pp.50-51. Barton-The Religions of The World,pp323-324. Rainy-The Ancient Christian Church,chaps.20-21. Wells-The Outlines of History, vol.I,pp.601-602. Fisher-Hist.of Christian Doctrine,p.134 ff. Fisher-Hist.of The Christian Church,pp.129-133. Schaff-Hist.of The Christian Church,vol.2,pp.618-650.Stephenson-The Hist.of Christian -ity,vol.I,pp.237-273. Foakes-Jackson-Hist of The Christian Church pp.297-320. Fairweather-Origen,pp.220-224. Hefele-Hist of The Councils.Dorner-Doct. of The Person of Christ,Div.I,Pt.2. Harnack-Hist of Dogma,vol.4.Foakes-Jacjson-Art.Arianism,in Dict. of Rel. and Ethics. Gwatkin-Studies of Arianism.Athanasius-De Synodus. Newman-Arians.Stanley-The Eastern Church.Socrates-Hist. Eccles. Burn-Introd.To The Creeds. Baker-Christian Doctrine. Bright-History of The Four Councils.

Notes and References on Chapter 5.

Page 2.
(a) Hatch,"The Hibbert Lectures",1888,Lect.10.

Page 4.
(a) Fisher,"History of Christian Doctrine"pp.51-52.
(b) Col.1-28,2-18;I Tim.4-3,5-10;I Jno.4-2;2 Pet.2;Jude 8f.
(c) Foakes-Jackson,"History of the Christian Church"p.129f.

Page 6.
(a) Rainy,"The Ancient Catholic Church",pp113-116.

Page 7.
(a) Dobschutz,"Life in The Primitive Church",p.254.

Page 8.
(a) Schaff,"History of The Christian Church",vol.2,p.96.
(b) Fisher,"History of Christian Doctrine",p.31.

Page 9.
(a) Foakes-Jackson,"History of The Christian Church",p.196.
(b) Inge,Art."Neo-Platonism"in Ency.of Relig.and Ethics.

Page 13.
(a) Foakes-Jackson,"Hist.of The Christian Church",p.315.

General Bibliography.

Adams-"The Religious Teachers of Greece",1908,Edinburgh.

Adeney-"The Greek and Eastern Churches",1908.

Addis-"Christianity and The Roman Empire",1893,Lond.

Allen-"The Continuity of Christian Thought",1887.

Angus-"The Environment of Early Christianity",1915.

Ante-Nicene Fathers,American Reprint of Edinburgh Edition,10 vols,
1899-1902.Works of Clement of Alex.vol.2.
Works of Origen,vols.4 and 9.

Arnold-"Roman Stoicism",Univ.Press,1911.

Bakewell-"Source Book of Ancient Philosophy",1907,N.Y.

Bailey and Kent-"History of the Hebrew Commonwealth",1920.

Bigg-"Christian Platonists of Alexandria",1886.
"Origins of Christianity",1909.
"Neo-Platonism",1895.

Breasted-"Ancient Times-A History of The Early World",1916.
"Conquest of Civilization",1926.

Brown-"The Wisdom of The Egyptians",1923.

Bruce-"St Paul's Concept of Christianity",1894.

Bryce-"The Holy Roman Empire",1911.

Budge-"Osiris and The Egyptian Resurrection", 2 vols,1904.
"Egypt",Universal Library,1925.

Burn-"The Athanasian Creed and Its Early Commentaries",1896.

Cambridge Ancient History,vol.6.

Carpenter-"Early Phases of Christianity",1916,N.Y.
"Pagan and Christian Creeds",1920.

Case-"The Evolution of Early Christianity",1914.

Charles-Eschatology-Hebrew,Jewish,and Christian",1899,Lond.
"Religious Development between the Old and New Testaments",
1914,N.Y.

Cheetham-"The Mysteries-Pagan and Christian",1897.

Caird-"Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers",2 vols,
1904.

Cheyne-"Jewish Religious Life after the Exile",1908,N.Y.

Clemens-"Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources",
Eng Trans,1912.

General Bibliography.

Cruttwell-"A Literary History of Early Christianity",2 vols,I893.

Cumont-"Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism",Eng Trans,I9II.

Deissman-"Light from The Ancient East",Eng Trans,I9I9.

De Labriolle-"History and Literature of Christianity",
Eng Trans,I925.

Dill-"Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius",I904-I9II.
"Roman Society in the Last Century of The Empire",I9I9.

Dobschutz-"Christian Life in The Primitive Church",Eng Trans,
I904.

Drummond-"Philo-Judaeus",I888.

Duchesne-"The Early History of The Church",4th Edition,Eng Trans.

Edersheim-"Life of Christ",3rd Edition,I886.

Eusebius-"Ecclesiastical History",Eng Trans,I892.

Fairbairn-"Philosophy of The Christian Religion",I903.

Farnell-"The Higher Aspects of The Greek Religion",I9I2.

Farrar-"Lives of The Fathers",2 vols,I889.
"Early Days of Christianity",I882.

Fairweather-"Background of The Gospels",I9II.
"Jesus and The Greeks",I924.Edin.
"Origen",I90I,N.Y.

Fisher-"The Beginnings of Christianity",I889.
"Church History",I902.
"The History of Christian Doctrine",I908.

Fosdick-"The Modern Use of The Bible", I925.

Frazer-"Folk Lore in The Old Testament", I927.

Ferrero-"The Ruin of Ancient Civilization and The Triumph of
Christianity",Eng Trans,I92I.

Gardner-"The Growth of Christianity",I907.
"The Religious Experience of St Paul",I9II.
"Exploratio Evangelica",I907,Lond.

Gavin-"Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought",I925.

Gibbon-"The Decline and Fall of The Roman Empire",7 vols,I897-
I900.

Glover-"The Conflict of Religions in The Roman Empire",5th Ed,
I9I3.

Gomperz-"Greek Thinkers",4 vols,I905-I9I2.

General Bibliography.

Grant-"The Orient in Bible Times",I920.

Guericke-"Church History",vol.I,Eng Trans,I869.

Gwatkins-"Early Church History",2 vols.I909,Lond.

Hall-"Historical Setting of The Gospels",I9I2.

Hatch-"Hibbert Lectures of I888".
"Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon The Christian Church",I890.

Harnack-"History of Dogma"(Outlines),Eng Trans,I893.
"The Expansion of Christianity",2vols,Eng Trans, I904-I905.

Herriot-"Philon le Juif".

Harrison-"Religion of Ancient Greece".

Hefele-"History of Church Councils",5 vols,Eng Tr.I872-I896.

Hyde-"From Epicurus to Christ",I904,N.Y.

Inge-"Christian Mysticism",I899.
"Philosophy of Plotinus",2 vols,I9I8.

Foakes-Jackson-"Church History"(Until 46I A.D.),7th Ed,I924.

Jones-"Studies in Mystical Religion",I909.

Joseph-"The Historical Development of Christianity",I925.

Kennedy-"Philo's Contribution to Religion",I9I9.
"St Paul and The Mystery Religions",I9I3.

King-"The Gnostics and Their Remains",I887.

Kruger-"History of Early Christian Literature"Eng Tr,I897.

Latimer-"From Cyrus to Titus",I899.

Legge-"Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity",2 vols,I9I5.
"Greek Worship of Serapis and Isis",I9I4.

Lindsey-"The Church and The Ministry in The Early Centuries", I908.

Mahaffy-"The Greek World Under Roman Sway",I890.
"What Have The Greeks done for Modern Civilization",I909.

Marshall-"Short History of Greek Philosophy",I89I,Lond.

Mead-"Apollonius of Tyana".I90I.

Merivale-"Conversion of The Roman Empire",2nd Ed,I865.

General Bibliography.

Mommsen-"Provinces of The Roman Empire"(vol.2),Eng Tr, 2nd Rev Ed,I909.

Moore C H-"Religious Thought of The Greeks",I9I6.

Moore G.F-"History of Religion",2vols,I920.

More-"Religion of Plato",I92I.

Montefiore-"The Old Testament and After",I923,Lond.

Morrison-"The Jews under Roman Rule",I890.

Moffatt-"Introduction to The Literature of The New Testament" 3rd Ed,I923.

Murray-"Stoic Philosophy",I9I5,N.Y.& Lond.

Milman's "History of Latin Christianity",4 vols,I893.

Neander-"History of Christian Religion and Church", 5 vols, Eng Tr,Rev Ed,I87I.

Nichols-"Growth of The Christian Church",2vols,I9I4.

Oakesmith-"The Religion of Plutarch",I902.

Orr-History and Literature of The Early Church",I902.

Peake-"Commentary on The Bible",I9I9.

Pfleiderer-"Christian Origins",I906,Eng Tr,N.Y.
"The Development of Christianity",Eng Tr,I9I0.

Philo's Works,4 vols,Trans from Greek by Yonge,I854.

Pressense-"Early Years of Christianity",Eng Tr,I87I-I879.

Rainy-"The Ancient Catholic Church",I908.

Ramsay-"The Church in The Roman Empire",I893.

Reinach-"A Short History Of Christianity",Eng Tr,I922.

Renan-"Marcus Aurelius",8th Ed,I899.

Rogers-"A Students' History of Philosophy",Rev Ed,I925.

Rostovtzeff-"A History of The Ancient World"(Rome),I927.

Schaff-"Church History"(vols I & 2),Rev Ed,I895.
"Creeds of Christendom",(vol 2),I890.

Scott-"The First Age of Christianity",I926.
"The Fourth Gospel,Purpose and Theology",I908.

Scott-Moncrieff-"Paganism and Christianity in Egypt",I9I3.

General Bibliography.

Slack-"Early Christianity",1908.

Schweitzer-"Paul and His Interpreters",Eng Tr,1912,Lond.

Schurer-"The Jewish People in The Time of Christ",3 vols, Eng Tr,from 2nd Ed,1890ff.

Sharpe- "Story of Egypt",2 vols, 1876.

Taylor-"Epicurus",1910.
"Plato",1908.

Tolson-"Roman Survivals the Chief Cause of Protestant Divisions"-"Christian Union Quarterly",July,1919.

Uhlhorn-"The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism", Eng Tr, 3rd Ed,1879.

Walker-"A History of The Christian Church",1918.

Waterman-"The Post-Apostolic Age" ,1898,N.Y.

Wenley-"Modern Thought and The Crisis in Belief",1909.

Wernle-"The Beginnings of Christianity",2 vols,Eng Tr,1903-04.

Watkins-"The Philosophy of Mysticism",1920.

Sharpe-"Mysticism"(For Pseudo Dionysius),1910,Lond.

Zeller-"Outlines of The History of Greek Philosophy"Eng Tr,1895.
"History of Eclecticism in Greek Philosophy"Eng Tr,1883.

Articles-"Philo","Clement",and"Origen",in Encyclopedia Brittannica, IIth Ed,Jewish Encyclopedia,1901-1907,and The Catholic Encyclopedia,1907-1912.Also "Alexandrian Theology" in Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,1908-1922.

GTU Library
3 2400 00686 0880

FOR REFERENCE

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

LIBRARY USE ONLY